BERKELEY BAPTIST DIVINITY SCHOOL LIBRARY

THE CROZER QUARTERLY

July, 1943

FORTY YEARS AMONG STUDENTS FOR THE BAPTIST MINISTRY — *W. N. Donovan* — 177

THE LETTER ALSO QUICKENETH — *George J. Weimar* — 189

THE MODERN IMPLICATION OF GREEK HISTORY — *Howard Comfort* — 196

THE MINISTER AS INTERPRETER — *James B. Pritchard* — 212

DISCIPLES OF LENTULUS — *Robert E. Keighton* — 217

EVIL AND GOD — *Homer H. Dubs* — 228

BRIGHTENING THE LONE STAR — *Rittenhouse Neisser* — 235

WHERE IGNORANCE IS BLISS, 'TIS FOLLY — 244

FROM OFF THE CAMPUS AND ON — 246

BOOK REVIEWS — 248

BOOK NOTICES — 261

BOOKS RECEIVED — 267

Volume XX Number 3

THE CROZER QUARTERLY

Published by
Crozer Theological Seminary
Chester, Pennsylvania

MORTON S. ENSLIN, Editor
RITTENHOUSE NEISSER, Business Manager

The policy of the CROZER QUARTERLY is to present investigations, discussions, and reviews in the field of religion which will prove of value and interest to the professional student of religion and to the layman.

Manuscripts, books for review, and communications for the editor should be addressed
Editor of the CROZER QUARTERLY
Chester, Pennsylvania
Business communications and subscriptions should be addressed
Business Manager of the CROZER QUARTERLY
Chester, Pennsylvania

Issued Quarterly $1.50 a year Single Numbers, 40 cents

Entered as second-class matter, December 21, 1923, at the post office at Chester, Pa., under Act of March 3, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized December 21, 1923.

Copyright, 1943, by Crozer Theological Seminary. All rights reserved.

THE JUDSON PRESS PRINTED IN U.S.A.

THE CROZER QUARTERLY
Vol. XX JULY, 1943 No. 3

FORTY YEARS AMONG STUDENTS FOR THE BAPTIST MINISTRY

W. N. DONOVAN

Andover Newton Theological School

A SCIENTIFIC discussion of Baptist theological education in the twentieth century would call for lists of seminaries, tables of class hours in various subjects, distinctions between Class A and Class B seminaries, with "notations" of each, an estimate of progress or retrogression during the period, and charts with graphs exhibiting percentages secured by proper proportional calculations.

This paper will disregard all these nice refinements of procedure, deal largely with personalities instead of abstract theories, refuse to argue the question of progress, try to be truthful in presenting features of seminary life which have seemed to the author interesting and significant, worthy of thought by those seeking the good of our churches.

In any consideration of ministerial education theological attitudes deserve first attention. Those of the early twentieth century derived so immediately from the close of the nineteenth century that reference to it must be made. The writer's personal student memories reach back for not merely forty but for fifty years.

A very noticeable legacy from the previous century was the importance given to the Bible as final authority in all situations. "The good book" or "Holy Writ" would be cited by lawyers addressing juries. Many teachers of science felt obliged to show that recent scientific discoveries were not at variance with Scripture properly interpreted. Very naturally, then, theologians were expected to adduce a Scripture passage and interpret it to support any proposition. The value of this proof text method was often, to be sure, highly dependent on the particular interpretation given to the texts, but texts must be had. Anything allegedly taken from the Bible was revered without great regard to its historic occasion, the peculiarities of its writer, or even the moral quality presented. A keen critic declared that excessive regard for the book which God had given was actually obscuring the God who gave the book. Under such conditions great attention would naturally be given to ascertaining the precise declarations of this ultimate authority. Hence the study of exegesis or hermeneutics was prominent in seminary curricula.

That this reverence for the exact words of Scripture promoted the study of the original languages hardly needs statement. Greek and Hebrew were a part of the course in standard seminaries. It was a common jest that a minister must be proficient in Hebrew for future converse with the angels since the Old Testament obviously quoted their native tongue. But quite as much influence must have been exerted by ideals of scholarship in which the classical tradition still played a notable part. It is frequently said that Harvard College required Hebrew for the first 165 years of its existence. Whatever the reason for this requirement may have been, William Rainey Harper's revival of Hebrew at Yale was hardly actuated by any extreme view of the Bible. Harper by his debate with William Henry Green of Princeton had made himself considered the leading American exponent of the documentary theory. This rested on discrimination in the use of biblical material instead of considering it as all of equal value. Such discrimination involved the whole process known as the higher or historical criticism. It was almost the antithesis of the view of an inspired text infallible in all avenues of life. The clash between the traditional view and the scrutiny of the material was in the air, but it had little effect on the theological instruction in Baptist seminaries at the beginning of the century. Men trained in the older views were, however, by their scholarship contributing to the newer attitude. Revised translations forced recognition of the human element in the production of the English text. Once this was acknowledged, there would be only a step to see anew the human factors in the formation of the Greek and Hebrew texts. The Canterbury Revision in the late nineteenth century had stirred independent thinking. The last decade of the century brought much public discussion of the material translated. New York dailies gave space to articles on Masoretic and pre-Masoretic texts in a way that would today be astonishing.

Faculties of Baptist seminaries were by no means unaware of the new winds that were stirring. Baptists had been active in translation work. In 1885 they had commissioned three of their seminary presidents to prepare a revised translation of the New Testament. The three were Presidents Broadus of the Southern Seminary, Hovey of Newton, Weston of Crozer. They were competent scholars and did admirable service. It is interesting to note that denominational zeal called for an edition of their work in which *baptizo* should be translated by the word "immerse." The reverend translators declined a student suggestion that they use the Anglo-Saxon "dip"; not to mention another student proposal to give John the astronomical designation of the "great dipper."

William Newton Clarke, in his *Sixty Years with the Bible*, has very engagingly depicted this extreme regard for the Bible, and the change to

a more vital feeling for the message of God through the Scripture. He had no small share in the change, but his major service was in the theological outlook to be noted later.

Dr. Clarke recalls how heavily the hand of Paul rested upon his first two churches. A seminary faculty were members of his second church. Of it he says that the training "had been rigidly Pauline for generations, and the atmosphere was full of the great apostle's influence. Rarely was a woman's voice heard in the church, his judgment of silence being accepted as the judgment of God." This condition continued after Dr. Clarke's pastorate and into our own century. Women might preside over public gatherings outside the church and address mixed audiences. Against this, says Dr. Clarke, there was no inspired prohibition. In the church, however, the women must keep silence. He does not tell of one theological argument by which the authority of Paul was supported, at a later day, if not in his pastorate. The theologian argued that Paul's advice to the Corinthians about marriage showed that he could distinguish between his own views and commands of the Lord given through him (I Cor. 7:10, 25, 40). Since he had this ability, he would be bound in honesty to warn his readers when he gave his personal opinion. Hence, whenever he did not specify that he was not writing by divine command, we must assume divine dictation of his words. To some of us the opposite view seemed at least a possibility. The story illustrates a view of inspired inerrant Scripture which persisted into our own century, and in some quarters still persists. Dr. Clarke refers to the struggle which thirty years ago came upon students who came to the seminary with ready-made theology, including, of course, a theory of inspiration. Such mental conflicts still occur; but they have been decreasing in number since Dr. Clarke wrote. His influence in this decrease will be noted later.

Before leaving this attitude toward the Bible, a word may be offered as to the languages. Both the Greek and the Hebrew of the Bible have suffered a loss of uniqueness, if not of dignity, in the last half-century. Burton's *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek* fairly rivaled Goodwin's work on the classical Greek. Yet some of us would pause between Burton and Winer to wonder how far the New Testament writers were conscious of promulgating a new dialect. Might it be that they were writing such Greek as would naturally be written by Hebrews who were assisted by their knowledge of the Greek translation of the Old Testament? The discovery of the kinship between the *koinē* and New Testament Greek helps one to feel how much the early Christian religion was a matter of everyday life. The study of the Greek Old Testament (commonly called the Septuagint) has had important bearing on the theory of a miraculously preserved text, besides adding not a little to our under-

standing of historical situations. As to the Old Testament original, knowledge of the more ancient languages cognate with Hebrew was well under way at the beginning of our period. Testimony to this is abundant in the revision of Gesenius' lexicon by Brown-Driver-Briggs. Unsuspected wealth has since poured in, and such discoveries as those at Ras Shamra and Maru emphasize the close relationship of the Hebrews to other ancient peoples both in language and thought. The whole effect has been to bring the Bible out of a mystical sacrosanct seclusion into closest relation with busy human life, to find the evidence of its inspiration in its conveyance of spiritual insight and power more than in any supposedly magical literary quality.

The theology of the period would appear to be naturally the next point for consideration. But another apparently limiting factor is mentioned first. Two reasons for so introducing it are: First, it also was inherited from the last two decades of the previous century; and second, it undoubtedly shared in the changed attitude which came to the seminaries. This limitation was the assumed necessity for holding truth in terms that conformed strictly to the ancient creeds, or to the conditions on which a school had secured its financial endowments. An extreme denunciation characterized this as financial control by a dead hand. It led to the famous heresy trials which some moderns say could no more be repeated than could the witchcraft trials of Salem. The noted Andover controversy came in the eighties and early nineties. The creed was by no means the only matter at issue; but to many it seemed that creedal conformity was elevated above intellectual ability and devotion to truth. For such an impression of theological education to get abroad among college students meant that many active minds would turn to the study of the sciences where thought was unrestricted in its investigation of facts. The controversy which agitated Union Seminary in the early nineties added to the collegians' suspicion of theological training. In this instance judgment turned on Professor Briggs's views as to the authority of Scripture. The public discussion was preparing men's minds for the change from the traditional conception of Scripture. That it came in the period of revised translation was most natural. That both the Andover and Union issues were carried before secular courts did not heighten the college man's estimation of seminary education. These two court trials affected the Congregational and Presbyterian denominations. One might expect Baptists to be free from disputes as to creed; but it soon appeared that people who avowedly had no creed might be very demanding of adherence to "confessions of faith." In the nineties the Whitsitt dispute at the Southern Seminary received great publicity. As in the two cases already named the issue had complications. To some students, however, it seemed that the question was

not whether Professor Whitsitt had correctly stated historic facts, but whether his statements were "Baptistic." That word was to have wide vogue in the denomination for some years to come.

This excursus on creedal control throws light on the theological situation at the turn of the century. Chairs of theology in Baptist schools were for the most part occupied by venerable men, reared in traditions of conformity to Scripture, properly interpreted, and of loyalty to the views stated by previous generations and insured by benefactions providing for their inculcation. To say this is not to disparage these excellent, earnest men, scholars of their day. But human thinking was changing. They descried the change, did not obstinately resist it, but were loyal to their early training. That called for submission to the verbal dictation of a Scripture infallible in prescriptions for all the events of life. And the words of that Scripture warned against "philosophy and vain deceit" (Col. 2:8, *philosophia*) and against "the oppositions of science (*gnosis,* I Tim. 6:20) falsely so called." It is amusing to recall the apprehensions expressed when Dr. Strong of Rochester flavored his theology with a theory of monism. This was introducing philosophy where Scripture should be dominant. Main objections were: Monism is not mentioned in the New Testament. No historic creed avows it. Dr. Strong's array of texts was held insufficient. The theory was not easily comprehended, even by some Rochester students. It played no great part in the theological revolution. Yet it was a courageous attempt to show that philosophy might have a place in man's conception of God. The criticisms stated above hint why many students felt that they were asked to substitute traditional authority for their own rational procedures. It appeared to them that the standard was not "Judge ye of yourselves what is right" (Luke 12:57) but be sure of a verbal coincidence with the King James translation or with the language of the creeds. A distinguished alumnus of one seminary put it that he and his classmates felt full freedom of thought and investigation as long as they gave preliminary assurance that they would reach an orthodox conclusion, however devious the path to it might be. They knew in advance where they must come out. Choice of route was free. Yet students and faculties in Baptist seminaries could not help hearing echoes from other schools. The Andover teachers had protested against a static Christianity. They voiced confidence that the spirit of God was concerned with new social and political ideas as well as with new scientific conceptions.

In the mid-nineties came a voice from Colgate that by no means made light of Scripture, but did react against using it as a mechanism or an apparatus to support a theory. W. N. Clarke insisted that the proper way to use the Scripture was to study it till its thought mastered one, then

speak out that thought. He may not have been a great philosopher; but he was not afraid to face philosophic problems and state frankly their bearing on man's relation to God. For some years Clarke's *An Outline of Christian Theology* brought joy to liberals and was anathema to many conservatives. Read it one must if he was to be reckoned among the educated ministry. Dr. Clarke found in the Bible a record of life that furnished the finest incentive to the highest living. It was inspiring. It was not a talisman or a magic means of divination. Once the first hubbub died down, his position came to be the normal one. Teachers of theology approached the subject either through the history of the Christian church or through current philosophy—the more common approach today. Seminary courses on the philosophy of religion mark the tendency. Both methods use the Bible as furnishing the finest source material for the study of religion, not as the arbiter of modern thought.

Another service which Dr. Clarke rendered was in renewed emphasis on the fatherhood of God. Zeal for "Christological theology" and for trinitarianism had almost subordinated the Father to the Christ. Clarke put new life into the thought of God and of Scripture. His greatest service may have lain in the resolve which he said that he always kept in mind as a teacher. No honest question should ever be barred from his classroom. An enquirer should always have the most honest answer of which the instructor was capable, even if it was a confession of ignorance. His frankness, sincerity, and fine Christian spirit won many back to an appreciation of the importance and value of theology. One keen student commented that there was nothing radically revolutionary in Clarke's books. "Their charm is that he says right out what many of us have been thinking all our lives, but either never dared to say it or else couldn't express it as he does." A conservative associate, scandalized by Clarke's treatment of the trinity and atonement, ended a violent protest with the declaration that "one of the greatest dangers about a lot of these heretics is that they are personally such lovable characters." Hosts of students *wanted* a theology associated with fearless thinking and lovable character.

Rochester had its lovable heretic in Rauschenbusch with his social passion. He, too, became a national figure. He was bitterly denounced for his exposure of the heartlessness of some business methods, but was loved devotedly by students who saw in Rauschenbusch the spirit of Jesus finding twentieth-century expression. The social significance of the Christian religion was being presented also by two graduates of the old-time Newton who were helping to build the new University of Chicago, Albion W. Small, founder of the university's department of sociology, and Shailer Mathews of the Divinity School.

A time of war inevitably brings startling changes in mental attitudes.

Memories of World War I bring back thrills of personal relationships that disclosed student consecration to ideals, willingness to suffer for one's fellows. Yet these altered attitudes were mainly in the emotional realm rather than in any reconstruction of systematic thought. Barthianism, even, is more a reactionary response under strain than a new conception. Some reviewers of history make the so-called fundamentalist controversy a consequence of the war. The sequence is chronological instead of logical. The points at issue were ancient. The zeal with which they were stated was often warlike. The bitterness sometimes found was largely on the part of those who had had no physical share in the conflict. In compensation they found emotional release in doctrinal attacks. The increased interest in chiliasm and symbolic interpretation is a normal accompaniment of war. Men who returned from the army to the seminaries came with a new sense of devotion of all that they possessed. Yet practically universal difficulty beset these men in seminary or college when they attempted concentrated individual thinking after the years of subjection to discipline and command.

If the postwar period has brought important adjustments of thought like those of the higher criticism and the social applications of religion, the writer has not been acute enough to recognize them. A new sense of corporate responsibility does appear in world student organizations. The changed character of programs in Student Volunteer conventions shows the practical turn of student interest. The emphasis on ecumenicity is again a practical demonstration rather than a new principle of thought. It roots back at least a century and a half, ultimately to Jesus, Paul, and the Old Testament statement of Abraham's mission.

To pass to curriculum requirements may seem like turning to the mechanism of the seminary life. The American seminary or divinity school is a composite of graduate study and technical training. In the old world theological study was a branch of university education and commanded the respect accorded to advanced intellectual discipline. Early American colleges were founded for the purpose of securing an educated ministry for the churches of the colonies. Training for the work of the parish was usually acquired by residence with some pastor of repute. About the beginning of the nineteenth century came the establishment of schools separate from colleges or universities. They were to offer intellectual discipline of university grade and professional training of a more intensive kind than a pastor could find time to give. The debate as to the relation of these schools to the universities still goes on. On the one hand it is often asserted that no seminary located on a university campus, or conducted as a department of a university, has had conspicuous success in training parish ministers. Chicago is a Baptist answer. Yale, Princeton,

Boston University are among the answers from other denominations. Meanwhile the scholastics retort that no seminary today commands high respect unless it has university affiliation to give the seal of approval to its courses.

The standard subjects of the early curricula still furnish the backbone of programs of instruction. They are, the study of Scripture, often divided into Old and New Testament departments, church history, doctrinal theology, homiletics, usually extended to cover parish administration. Public speech or voice training is often included under homiletics, but is actually taught by a specialist.

In the beginning of the period reviewed in this paper the elective system was making its way in education under the masterful leadership of President Eliot of Harvard. Some seminaries accepted it joyously. Some have resisted it even to this day. It is generally held that a student should have some acquaintance with each of the subjects named above, while by electives he gives more specific attention to the one of them in which he is said to "major." As might be expected, there has been a transfer of interest from biblical electives to those dealing with subjects classed as "practical." Courses undreamed of fifty years ago deal with philosophy in its bearings on religion, with various aspects of psychology, with social relations, with study of other religions, with pedagogy, music, literature, drama, and pageantry. For the last thirty years courses or departments of religious education have been attached to many schools. These are reminders that it has not been unusual for seminaries to maintain annexes of one kind or another. For illustration, Gordon College was once the Gordon School of The Newton Theological Institution. Another development found in many seminaries is the supervised practice work in churches, hospitals, social agencies.

A ludicrous aspect of the elective situation often appears in alumni demands for special electives. Brethren who have encountered unexpected problems frequently lament that the seminary had not coached them for such emergencies. A resolution is passed at an alumni meeting calling on the seminary to give instruction adequate for such occasions. A college president once bluntly demurred to such a motion: "The seminary can't do that. If the Lord hasn't given a man any more sense, the seminary can't furnish it."

A notable feature in curricular development has been the decline in the study of the original languages of the Bible. At the beginning of the century both were generally required. Today they receive rather less attention than the modern languages get in college. One of them is commended as a part of a liberal education, but the minister will probably have even less knowledge of Hebrew or Greek than the college graduate

will have of French, German, or Spanish. So little are linguistic courses elected that it is a surprise to find an elective group working on Greek Old Testament or patristic Greek, not to mention Semitics.

One cannot review a half-century without remarking the impressive growth of interest in liturgy, ritual, and observance of the church year. To be sure the review begins at a period a little later than the time when Christmas in Boston found no Protestant church open and no saloon closed. It does include the time when Thanksgiving still outranked Christmas as a religious occasion in most New England communities. Easter was still considered Romish if not pagan. A Baptist minister in a gown was a wonder if not an abomination. The Prince Albert frock coat was the desideratum of a minister's wardrobe, although its use was by no means restricted to the clergy. The use of the Apostles' Creed, the general confession, or even the general thanksgiving, was deprecated by many. Notwithstanding the aversion to "popery," there was surprising bondage to some Catholic conceptions. An instance is the stipulation that no unordained student or instructor might pronounce the benediction. The ordination ceremony seemed to constitute ministers a separate caste in society.

To turn to the mechanism of administration may strike one as taking up faculty memories instead of student affairs. Students and administration are, however, intimately related. The outstanding administrative development is in the position and functions of the seminary president or dean. Early seminaries managed to exist under mere faculty control. One professor was chairman, much as the rector of a German university officiated when the universities were yet independent. When a president was chosen he was *primus inter pares* of the teaching faculty. The president of today has become the head of a business enterprise. He must be an expert on the care of valuable property and large investments. He must maintain a high educational rating for his institution. He must be in close touch with denominational boards. He must place his graduates and dependent students. He must keep contact with college sources of supply. He is almost a bishop coadjutor to the secretary of his state organization. Classroom teaching is largely incongruous with his peripatetic duties. The tendency to official specialization is very noticeable in recent years. Baptist seminaries are fortunate in the men on whom these new responsibilities have fallen.

A feature of this official service is the securing of students. The old idea was that seminary education was a privilege to be sought. Admission was granted by the faculty only to suitably qualified youths who were sure of a call to the ministry. Now the idea must be "sold" to the college students. The first active appeal for students known to the writer was by Professors Brown and Burton, the "boys" of the Newton faculty of that

day, the eighteen eighties. Alarmed at the inclination of scholarly college men to turn to the greater freedom of scientific study, they toured eastern colleges with their presentation of the opportunities of the Christian ministry. They were urging the attention of Christian students to the calling, not to a particular school. It would be over a decade before seminaries would be bidding for students. Collegians still wondered if seminaries would accept them instead of coyly avoiding solicitors. Typical of the later decade is the memory of a student standing at a telegraph window and saying, "Here are offers from three seminaries. Now if I can get Dr. ——— at ——— to raise them I ought to have something pretty good for next year." Few were so frankly mercenary, although, as one president observed, "the choice of a seminary often was determined by reasons pecuniary to the student."

Other than financial inducements also came into consideration. The influence of Chicago had been strong in establishing theological degrees as evidences of scholarly attainments. The terms on which one might be acquired became a factor in the choice of a seminary. Some wonderful bargains were made by shrewd offering of college courses. This situation was not confined to theological seminaries. The thirst for degrees was affecting every profession. It led President Lowell of Harvard to call course credits one of the gravest maladies of American education, and prompted his other statement that he was a firm believer in the right of every student to the highest possible degree with the least possible exertion. Seminary applicants were simply applying to their problems the business methods elsewhere approved. Innocent presidents felt the duty to give all possible aid to a potential minister.

Presidents and faculties deplored this competition. Regret at its existence was one of the reasons for the organization of the Baptist Theological Faculties Union. Its members sought to unify conditions of admission and standards for degrees, to set limits to offers of aid, to discover curricular requirements most profitable for the ministry in the twentieth century, to cultivate social acquaintance and fraternal relations among the different faculties. Very delightful are memories of the hospitality of entertaining faculties who opened their homes to delegates, shared family worship, and ennobled conceptions of the common task by opening their hearts to their comrades. A drawback was that delegates had no power to bind their absent colleagues to proposed actions. The high ideals of the meetings did not always go into complete effect. Under such circumstances it was natural that suspicions of competition should persist. The greatest service of the union was said to be the beautiful hospitality and acquaintance which it fostered. There were, however, many important conferences. Much committee work was done. Many

of the proposals for standardizing requirements for curricula and degrees naturally came from Chicago. One suggestion of the forward look of the members is found in the fact that the idea of the comprehensive or general examination at the end of the course was broached in the Union nearly forty years ago. President Merrill at Colgate was experimenting with the plan now so widely used and sharing his discoveries with fellow members. Perhaps the largest service may be inferred from the repeated remark of President Lowell that it was knowledge of the Baptist Union which led him in 1918 to call a meeting of representatives of all seminaries. The immediate object was consideration of problems arising from World War I. There developed from the meeting the organization of the Association of Theological Seminaries in the United States and Canada, which includes all Protestant denominations. A long chapter might be written on the work of this association in standardizing curricula and methods of instruction, in substituting coöperation for competition. It has been largely influential in getting graduate support for higher standards of requirements for ordination.

Another long and interesting chapter could be written about movements for concentration. Mr. Rockefeller sponsored a proposal that seminaries in neighboring sections of the country should combine and then be given suitable endowments for prosecuting higher education. The Colgate-Rochester combination is the most conspicuous result. Conditions on which various schools had been founded and endowed forbade their merging or moving. For example, the legal objections to moving Newton out of New England were deemed insuperable. Moreover it became obvious that combination would not attain the expected object of diminishing the number of seminaries. A new one would spring up in any section left vacant by the centralization process. The newcomer would make its own bid for students and endowment. Half of the seminaries now listed in the Baptist *Yearbook* were founded since 1900. The Andover Newton coöperative agreement hardly comes under the head of concentration. It is a highly gratifying instance of interdenominational fellowship and united effort on essentials. The two schools were, however, already in the same area, and there were many legal issues which could hardly be considered as parts of a planned concentration or reduction of number.

Much has been said about changes among the educators. It is difficult to say whether student bodies have developed new characteristics that are essential. Certainly the men of today clothe themselves and their ideas in raiment easily distinguishable from that of their grandfathers. Many of their habits would astonish old-timers who never dreamed of their equipment and opportunities. At heart they have the same belief that the one hope of humanity is in the knowledge of Jesus Christ. They have

the same devoted desire to make him known. On the one hand it is easy to say that they have a more objective view of the minister's task. They are much more concerned with things to be done, with organizations and programs, than with meditations on dogma. Another observer will pronounce them more subjective. Psychological investigation of human personality largely replaces interest in ancient controversies over the spiritual world. Whether or not they use Pope's words, they tend to his view,

> Know then thyself, presume not God to scan;
> The proper study of mankind is man.

Men of the older generations frequently stated that their ambition was to be "workmen needing not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth." Recently a student said to the writer, "You see, I have but one short life to live. I want to make it count for the utmost in the Kingdom." He was thinking in terms of effective accomplishment more than of personal development. Neither ideal can entirely displace the other. A retrospect of life among these alert, devoted personalities must needs be a happy one. Thoughts of the changes that must follow the present world struggle are heartened by evidences of present efforts to put new meaning into conceptions of the realm of God in human living.

THE LETTER ALSO QUICKENETH

GEORGE J. WEIMAR

Simon Gratz High School, Philadelphia

CHRISTIANITY seems destined, in one form or another, to become the final world religion. And the reason is near to hand. From its very beginning it has always been, systematically and emotionally, a syncretism. In a measure this has been true of every great religion. Because of its amazingly flexible adaptability and its power of absorbing, Christianity may well be styled a pansyncretism. It has poured its vivifying spirit, as into moulds, into such heterogeneous forms of religious thought as Judaism, Paulinism, Platonism, Philonism, Mithraism, Gnosticism, and Manichæism; and just when they threatened to become moribund and to imprison it within their dead letter, it has arisen into a new pleroma of life, enriched by, but also shaped and marked by, these moulds. Thus, who can deny the inspirational force of Christmas despite its formal and commercial phases? Yet it was unknown to the early church, and its celebration on the 25th of December was adopted only about 350 A.D.; the Mithraic celebration of that day as *Natalis invicti solis* and the Marcionite Manichæan heresy that Christ was never born in the flesh but was always a mere phantasm are probably the main reasons for the ultimate choice.

We are apt to quote glibly, "The letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life,"[1] as though it were an absolute *either—or,* excluding any possibility of interaction, forgetting that Jesus himself applied both the correction and the complement: "I came not to destroy, but to fulfil. . . . One jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass away from the law, till all things be accomplished."[2] He thus realizes with Aristotle that the letter, the mould, the form, is not a mere dead and deadening skeleton but contains inherently a creative and vitalizing force, an entelechy. His clear eye saw within the strait jacket of the Jewish law the feeling of the reality of God and of his personal relationship to men, which he brought to full fruition and accomplishment with his revolutionary conviction of the potential sonship of all men.

An obvious example of the close interaction of letter and spirit is furnished by the history of the church itself. When the first flush of enthusiastic waiting for the second coming was over, the early amorphism had to crystallize into some definite form. Nothing is more significant than the way it gradually assumed the shape of the vast organization it was

[1] II Cor. 3: 6.
[2] Matt. 5: 17 f.

completely to supersede, the old Roman Empire.[3] This solid and enduring structure, the "feste Burg," of the Roman Catholic Church gave Christianity the necessary strength to survive the destructive storms of the Dark Ages.

Kai ho logos sarx egeneto. Far more subtle, because of its essentially subjective and subconscious nature, is the debt which modern Occidental Christianity owes to the ancient world of art, especially to Greek sculpture, and to the emotions and ideas latent, or only partially expressed, in art works. Christianity is preëminently a *personal* religion: all the systems of logical or illogical theology may come and go, but it will rise or fall depending solely on our emotional reaction to the personality of Jesus. Personality demands human form, and it is most significant how through the ages the concepts of the God-man, virgin birth, heavenly messengers, evil, have gradually and inevitably assumed certain definite visualizations. Whenever we hear the words, "Jesus Christ" we see a tall, kindly man with long flowing hair and beard, as Thorwaldsen has brought him before us on the Lake of Lucerne; "Virgin Mary," the Madonna of the Italian painters; "angels," with white wings and long flowing white garments; "the devil," horns, tail, pitchfork, in red, breathing fire and brimstone. Let us try to see how these came about.

When the fateful transfer of Christianity from East to West was made by St. Paul, the infant faith was confronted with a fearful dilemma, the solution of which probably saved it from extinction. All around was a mælstrom of the most diverse religions and superstitions appealing to the high with all sorts of speculations as to nature, man, fate, God, etc., and to the low with sensuous rites, and—most important of all—with idols bringing the gods to them out of the clouds. We must remember that most of the membership of the early church, both Jewish and gentile, was among the lowly. At first, since the Jewish influence was strong enough to prevent any use of pictures or statues, there is no really early Christian art; but when the membership became overwhelmingly gentile, the problem became acute. The answer which satisfied the Western mass mind was the adoption of the picture or icon as merely the symbol of the divine. Its use as a settled policy explains the hold of churches like the Greek or Roman Catholic over the masses today.

Let me emphasize here a cardinal point. The influence of art on the modern public mind is every limited. Our works of art are sequestered in galleries and museums; we visit them once or twice more or less as a duty; we do not see them around us in our daily lives, waking or

[3] Dieser Religion gab nun auch überdies das römische Reich ihre äussere Gestalt" ("This religion now received from the Roman empire its external form also")—Leopold von Ranke, *Die Römischen Päpste,* p. 15.

sleeping; art and artists are a thing apart, more or less queer. Now compare with this picture another: Suppose that we could reduce life to its most elemental terms; could take away all our modern distractions—if war doesn't do it for us—autos, railroads, radios, newspapers, etc.; could give back completely the few simple things, nature, the sky, a living religion incarnate in beautiful forms of the gods, a feeling of oneness, in which religion and patriotism were inextricably united, and with our country so small that it were limited by our city's horizon adding intensity and personality to the feeling. Art, as the fullest visible expression of the highest aspirations of the community, attains a soundness and dignity impossible when subject only to individual caprice: we can understand the ethical power of art as pointed out by the greatest and sanest of Greek thinkers, such as Plato and Aristotle; yet it is so puzzling from the modern viewpoint. Add the important fact, never to be forgotten, that there were no museums in the ancient world to hide away art for dust covering. It is hard for us to realize, as we see the mere "fragment of fragments"—if we may adapt Goethe's word about literature—which we have of ancient works of art, that the Greek world and a good deal of the Mediterranean world, on the other hand, were literally covered with them.

We need not be surprised, then, that after their first repugnance to idols had been overcome the early Christians, as they felt a growing need for visualization, created no new art but poured their thoughts and emotions into the mould ready at hand. In the catacomb frescoes, Orpheus with his lute taming wild beasts symbolizes the peaceful power of Christ; Ulysses deaf to the Sirens is the perfect picture of the true believer deaf to worldly temptations. Not only is Christ frequently represented as the Good Shepherd bearing a lamb, the latter also a reminder of the *Agnus Dei*, but also in what is probably the oldest Christian statue that has come down to us, a marble statuette from the third or fourth century, now in the Lateran Museum, in Rome, the resemblance to Hermes, the god of shepherds, is too striking to be accidental. Hermes was worshiped under this form, carrying a sheep, as *Kriophoros*, (*i.e.*, "ram-bearer") at Tanagra, according to Pausanias.[4] This Christian work may well be compared—not in technique, or course—with the exquisite Hermes of Praxiteles. Striking and unique is the similarity in gentleness and kindly refinement of both.

There is not an iota of real evidence as to the personal appearance of the historic Jesus. What caused the earlier beardless type to disappear in favor of the bearded one we do not know, but I believe it was the influence of the mould created by the Olympian Zeus of Phidias. Not stowed away in a museum but accessible to all at what was geographically

[4] Pausanias ix, 22, 1.

and emotionally the very heart of the Greek world, Olympia, the site of the Olympian games, which for more than a thousand years held the Greeks together more than did anything else, stood this chryselephantine statue, great in every sense of the word, in the value of the materials, gold and ivory, in workmanship, in size and significance. Quintilian's famous judgment, that it added something to the conventional religion and left a man better than before, need only to be recalled to indicate the effect of this supreme masterpiece of the Greek genius. It was removed to Byzantium in the fifth century A.D. and perished in the great fire of 476 A.D., which, by a curious coincidence, is also the date historians usually agree to take as the end of the ancient world.

Innumerable reproductions of every kind, including coins, made this type universally familiar. The majestic Otricoli Zeus in the Vatican has certainly caught the calm power and serene nobility of the original, but most arresting and rewarding long consideration and thought is a little, worn, unpretentious coin of Elis,[5] from about the fourth century B.C. Here, with a few simple, almost crude, strokes the *Logos* has indeed become flesh, and the letter has quickened as by a miracle into ineffable spirit. The impression of authority is unmistakable: here is One who truly does not speak "as the scribes"; it takes little imagination to transform the chaplet of leaves into the crown of thorns. No longer can we find Dante, the most Christian of poets, incongruous when he calls Christ

> O Jove Supreme!
> Who upon earth for us wast crucified.[6]

Across the Ægean Sea, almost opposite to Olympia, was another famous wonder of the old world, the Mausoleum at Halicarnassus, erected by the Carian queen Artemisia in memory of her husband, Mausolus, about 350 B.C. This splendid monument, which lasted almost down into the modern period—it was destroyed by the Knights of St. John in 1522 A.D.—was in the midst of that teeming life which was Asia Minor—that effective bridge between the Holy Land and the West. Atop the great building were statues of Mausolus and his queen. That of the king—now in the British Museum—has been preserved unusually well. This bearded, regal figure with the long flowing locks is a veritable incarnation of that gentle and truly royal power which needs not to be exerted to be felt. The Phidian influence is evident; the potentialities of the Christ are there, too.

Can we trace back any of the roots of the Madonna type to Greek sources? Some thirty miles due south of Halicarnassus is the city of Cnidus, once renowned as the home of the loveliest statue of all antiquity,

[5] For an excellent reproduction see H. Luckenbach, *Kunst und Geschichte,* Vol. I, p. 56.
[6] . . . "o sommo Giove,
Che fosti in terra per noi crocifisso"—*Purgatorio* vi, 118 f.

the Cnidian Aphrodite of Praxiteles. It has not survived, but has probably been re-created in the Venus of Milo. Christianity seems to have been unaffected by the Venus cult, but in a mutilated figure found in 1857 at Cnidus, and now in the British Museum, dating from the fourth century B.C. and representing Demeter mourning for Persephone, we have something undeniably startling. Never in any Christian portrayal of the sorrowing mother of the crucified Christ has dignified and resigned, yet intense maternal suffering found more touching and beautiful expression. In the disputed so-called "Great Chalice of Antioch" the faces of both the youthful and the mature Christ bear a filial resemblance to her. Common to all three, centred mainly in the deep-set eyes, is the feeling of passionate, yet vague and restrained sadness, the Vergilian *"lacrimæ rerum."* This was first brought into art by the famous Greek sculptor, Scopas (390-345 B.C.).

Walter Miller[7] sees in the modern Greek celebration of the death and resurrection of Christ from Good Friday to Easter Sunday an exact copy of the ancient Eleusinia, when the departure of Persephone, the mourning of Demeter, and the joy on the return of the daughter were celebrated with the same ceremonies. It is no accident that the beautiful statue of the pagan *Mater Dolorosa* was found in Asia Minor. The predominant feminine influence there started with the very old worship of a mother goddess, one of whose names was Cybele, to whom a temple was dedicated in Rome as early as 200 B.C.[8] In Ephesus she assumed the grotesque form of the many-breasted Artemis, and after the destruction of the great temple a curious memory of her lingered on in the strange local belief that Ephesus was the last home of the Virgin Mary.

In the West there was a comparative lack of attention paid to the *Regina Cœli.* The earliest embodiment is in a mural in the Priscilla catacomb, Rome, about 130 A.D., and she does not become prominent until about a thousand years later. The *Ave Maria* as a form of prayer is first mentioned in the second half of the eleventh century, the famous Latin hymn *Stabat Mater Dolorosa* of Jacopone dates from about 1300, and one of the first Madonnas in painting is by Guido da Siena in 1221. The inference is worth considering that the crusades and the early Renaissance brought also a rebirth of this feminine emphasis from the East and Byzantium.

About the derivation of another characteristic feature of Christian visualization, the angel type from the winged *Nike* or Victory, we are surely all in accord today. Notable only is the persistent Hebrew gynæphobia in the change to the masculine, although a conception like the

[7] *Greece and the Greeks,* p. 205.
[8] *Livy* xxix, 10-14.

Victory of Samothrace, instinct and thrilling with recent battle, needs little imagination to be seen as Gabriel, or Michæl, archangel leader of the victorious hosts of heaven. The fifth-century *Nike* of Pæonius, on the other hand, furnishes a hint as to where the more conventional idea of a soothing and consoling divine messenger came from.

Facilis descensus. The descent to Avernus may be easy, but to trace the ancestral traits of its sulphurous monarch is difficult. We are not concerned here with his psychological origin but only with his appearance. We need not be surprised to find contradictory traits; *e.g.,* his horns are indubitably pagan, derived in the main from Pan, or from temple statues of Bacchus, or from portrayals of Alexander the Great with the ram's horns of his putative father, Jupiter Ammon; yet in the Bible horns are invariably mentioned favorably as symbols of power.[9] In the light of our present evidence we may list as fairly certain the following: his pitchfork is Neptune's trident; his pointed ears come from the fauns; his hoofs and tail are to be ascribed to the centaurs and satyrs; sulphur and fire and the lower world as his habitat, from the connection of volcanoes, especially Mt. Ætna in Sicily, with Vulcan.

In reference to this last point I cannot help venturing a daring conjecture concerning one of his names, Mephistopheles, made famous in the *Faust* cycle by Marlowe and Goethe. The current etymology from *mē, phōs, philos*—"no lover of light"—is not quite adequate, nor is the more ingenious one of K. J. Schröer,[10] from the Hebrew *mephis* (destroyer) and *tophel* (liar), although supported by the fact that in the popular magic books of the sixteenth century most of the demons do have Hebrew names. These seem too obviously made to order; the name Lucifer and the constant association with fire would contradict the former, and there are too many peculiar traits to be explained by the latter, such as the fiery red garb and the limp.[11] In one of the earlier forms of the story, *Dr. Fausts Höllenzwang,* he appears first as a fiery bear, then as a little man with a bald head. I believe there is only one figure which could be the nucleus for this strange conception, that of the Olympian god of fire, Hephæstus.

The similarities it seems to me are too many and striking to be accidental. Both are flung from heaven or Olympus to earth or to hell; both limp; the appearance of Mephistopheles as a bear or bald-headed little man may well be due to the fact that in statues Vulcan was usually shown as a short, stocky man with rough, unkempt hair, kept down over the crown of the head with a tight-fitting cap worn by smiths—which

[9] I Sam. 2: 1; Psalms 75, 89, *et passim;* cf. especially Psalm 148: 14.

[10] *Faust* (ed. 1886), Heilbronn, I, 25.

[11] In Goethe's *Faust,* I, 2184, in the scene in Auerbach's *Keller,* Siebel, one of the roisterers, looking askance at Mephistopheles, says: "Was hinkt der Kerl auf einem Fuss?"

latter would certainly suggest baldness. His small stature calls to mind another remarkable point: the Greeks frequently put dwarf statuettes of him near their hearths.

The name Mephistopheles or Mephisto in the shorter and perhaps earlier form is certainly corrupt, and lends itself just as plausibly, and even less fancifully than the accepted interpretation, "no friend of light," to the reading *Mē Iphisto* (the Italian form of Hephæstus), that is, "No, Hephæstus!" or "No friend of Hephæstus" (*Me Iphisto philes*). This may well have been a form of exorcism, a sort of "Get thee hence, Satan!" If the *philes* is not a later accretion, it would appear to add: 'Here is no friend of yours."

How large a part visualization plays in all religious thinking and feeling is a moot point, but the great mass of humanity will always leave it to the professional theologians and philosophers, along with the mathematicians, to live in the ivory tower of abstract symbols—predestination, salvation by faith or works, the Trinity, sin or evil, etc.—while they fight the sweaty battle of life, led on and inspired by an Olympian Christ, consoled by a Demeter-*Mater Dolorosa,* visited by *Nike*-Angels, and, if they falter, carried down to the fierce flames of the volcanic forge of Vulcan by a Hephæstus-Mephistopheles. Perhaps it is a matter for no idle speculation whether out of this modern Armageddon new moulds are being formed to suit the new conditions; nonetheless we feel sure that the quickening and enrichment of the religious spirit by the letter of Greek art will not be lost.

THE MODERN IMPLICATION OF GREEK HISTORY

HOWARD COMFORT

Haverford College

Even the learned fringe of the public, to say nothing of the great mass itself, knows little history and is congenitally either unwilling or unable to apply the inferences of what little it does know. Our own century of alleged progress culminating in the Global War has been especially delinquent in profiting by the past mistakes of the human race. The present sketch represents a tentative attempt to discuss some of these from the ancient Greek point of view. It is entirely legitimate to do so. For although modern thought adopts a patronizing tone toward antiquity, there is probably not a single modern problem which lacks an immemorially ancient prototype in terms of which it can be discussed. Our admiration at the streamlined technical jargon and graphs wherewith we have clarified matters, or obscured them, should not blind us to the fact that *basic problems are absolutely timeless* and that with all our fluid credit, geopolitics, electricity, and steam *we have neither altered the problems themselves nor managed to circumvent the relentless sequence of the same old effects from the same old causes.* Furthermore, for our purposes ancient history is a better source of precedents than are the more modern histories of Western Europe and the United States. Of these latter we ourselves are merely the current installment; we cannot read them or even write them, much less interpret them, with intellectually honest detachment. Of course, judged by our standards ancient trends and movements were not complex, and they lack the superficial mechanized element, but this very simplicity throws their lessons into all the higher relief.

We can clarify what follows by stating the conclusion before examining the evidence. Our purpose is to explore a formula for that "just and durable peace" of which the pursuit has become a leading American indoor sport, and we find that the most direct path to our goal is a quick analysis of the opposite number, war. Two observations are obvious on inspection: first, that there is no war without at least two sovereigns in conflict over some real or fancied cause (in civil wars a would-be sovereign is attacking the sovereignty of constituted authority); second, that as long as two sovereigns exist, they are potential enemies and in practice become actual enemies. Our conclusion will therefore be that if we really mean business about this "just and durable peace," we must think in terms of one single world sovereignty and no more. Whether we like the thought

and its implications doesn't much matter; there is the fact. It does not follow that the abolition of all sovereignties but one will of itself produce the just and durable peace, for there are many additional hurdles to be surmounted. Our conclusion is stated more accurately in the negative—if we do *not* develop a world sovereignty, we shall *never* attain the desired end. Plural sovereignties and world peace are ultimately incompatible, as is indicated by the history of ancient Greece.

Ancient Greece resembled the modern world in many striking respects. Just as the latter was preceded by the imperial Roman civilization, so the former was preceded by the imperial Minoan civilization which also fell before invading northern barbarians and left of itself only a few monuments, some survivals of religion and language, and a touch of law and custom. In both cases several centuries of Middle Ages followed upon the ruination, during which centuries nothing much "happened" although the results clearly show that all the time a new civilization was gestating until its fated moment. Then at length we can dimly descry something recognizable, political centres emerging on hilltops and at seaports in patterns different from those of the old civilization—not yet consolidated into final form, but nevertheless foreshadowing the future development. In Greece, this emerging civilization rested upon two main supports, agriculture and sea-borne commerce. Politically speaking, the Greeks were phenomenally far advanced even in this period of dawn, for monarchy was already virtually *passé* and had been supplanted in some instances by a landowning aristocracy and in others by an aristocracy of merchant princes. In the eighth century before Christ the great Greek cities were essentially maritime, while the less prominent towns like Athens were still agricultural.

Ancient Greece also resembled the modern world, and especially modern Europe, in being perhaps a state of mind and of culture, but not a political entity. No unitary government corresponding to the modern Kingdom of Greece either existed or was imagined. During their most characteristic epoch the ultimate development of the gifted Greek race was the city-state or sovereign municipality. Even Plato and Aristotle never visualized their ideal States as anything other than cities. Greek municipalities managed their own currencies and economies; they made and enforced their own sovereign laws for their own citizens; they were jealous of their own citizenships; they had their own constitutions and were bound by no others except through the misfortunes of war; for their military operations and the conduct of their diplomacy they were responsible to no authority higher than themselves; they reserved the right to see any problem from their own angle only, and to act accordingly. When under the foreign domination of any other city their one thought was for the

recovery of autonomy. Towns like Athens, Thebes, Megara, and Sparta, or the insular settlements, meant just as much to their citizens as modern nations mean to theirs, and for purposes of analogy they are without any qualifications the equivalent of modern nations. Though they reckoned their citizens only by thousands and their areas by only a few square miles, each one was a sovereign nation among its peers.

No apology for our analogy is necessary when we realize that through modern methods of transport and communication our whole globe is much closer to itself than was the minuscule world of ancient Greece. If we follow the historian Thucydides in "imagining that former ages were not great either in their wars or in anything else," we are wrong; for the all-important ratio of space to time was actually *greater* in antiquity than now. How far could perishables be transported? How fast could a message of international significance be delivered? Against the unwavering standards of sunup to sundown our world is not larger than theirs but significantly smaller, and their city-states were actually farther separated than are our nations.

"As Hellas grew more powerful and the acquisition of wealth became more and more rapid, the revenues of her cities increased, and in most of them tyrannies were established," so that in the course of time, about 632 B.C., an Athenian nobleman named Cylon, whose father-in-law was the tyrant or absolute ruler at the near-by town of Megara, decided that he would like to be tyrant at Athens. Cylon misjudged his timetable by about sixty years through failure to realize that the "acquisition of wealth" had not progressed at Athens as far as it had at Megara and that therefore the time for tyranny was not yet economically ripe, but the mere fact that he tried at all hints at some developments which were apparent to him, though not to us, which seemed to justify the risk.

These developments are still elusive when Draco codified the Athenian law in 621 B.C. at the end of the following decade. But any codification of law is a symptom of something broader, rather than an isolated and unrelated incident. Insofar as it forces a ruler or ruling class to publish the rules where everyone can see them, it foreshadows democracy. Even Magna Carta, a private affair between King John and his aristocracy, is democratic in its implications.

Twenty-seven years later in 594 B.C. the impulse behind both Cylon and Draco becomes much clearer. The great Solon undertook his sweeping economic and political reorganization of Athens. He is the first Athenian to embody the future industrial and commercial destiny of his city into a deliberately integrated constitution. By substituting general wealth for mere real estate in meeting political prerequisites, by offering full Athenian citizenship to immigrant tradesmen and artisans, by requiring

that all boys be taught a trade, and particularly by devaluing the Attic drachma to bring Athens into the world's main commercial currents Solon designedly shifted the emphasis of Athenian economy from the farm to the shop and the dock. Without these reforms which reflect Solon's recognition of the trend, Athens would never have become what she did. And no less is true of his political reforms which recognized the sanctity of the person and extended new political rights to the lower middle classes—heavily loaded democratic measures which had to accompany the economic enactments. Solon gave permanent direction to an industrial revolution and all that this implies. Money quickly became more plentiful and prices rose. So did employment. To us this revolution may not seem like much, but like its more familiar successor in eighteenth-century England it transformed a conservative state into international political dynamite by directing its attention toward international trade on a wholly new scale. In its own degree and in its own world it is comparable to the modern industrial revolution of which we ourselves are a part. Even students of ancient history tend to underestimate the significance of the Athenian revolution in their own field, for industrial revolutions involve certain long-range results which apply with impersonal relentlessness to Athenians, British, Americans, Germans, and Japanese. In the case of Athens the first fruits had not long to wait, for within a few years Solon discovered that Athens "needed," as we say, to control the "lovely isle of Salamis," a Megarian possession situated at Athens' doorstep and dominating the approaches to Athens' harbor. Only with this anxiety liquidated could Athens continue to be sure of unhampered access to the seaways, and so Athens realistically and expeditiously appropriated Salamis from Megara.

During the remainder of the sixth century we can infer from literary sources what is also abundantly plain from the shelves of our museums—an immense expansion of Athenian manufacturing and prosperity. Athens had now "acquired so much wealth" that a tyranny became logical. The absolute ascendancy of Peisistratus and his sons, which began a generation after Solon and lasted until 510 B.C. was no cheap political racket among slums. Like its predecessors in Miletus, Corinth, Megara, Argos, and other maritime cities, it represented the emergence of an essentially non-agricultural financial aristocracy with standards of elegance and taste. The great public works and elaborate festivals of Peisistratus were not the sour fruit of backwoods rusticity. On the one hand, there was money to spend upon the best that artisans could produce; on the other, Peisistratus emulated Solon in continuing to make Athens attractive to skilled immigrants. He also extended the Solonian policy of extraterritorial consolidation of Athens' sea lanes. This last was not exactly imperialism, for

"imperialism" is a brutal, ugly word; it was just a sensible ounce of prevention and insurance at the expense of others.

Of course industrialization and democratization went hand in hand. Tyranny was not the end of democracy, but a step toward it. The Athenian industrial revolution inevitably produced its own counterpart of the British Reform Bill of 1833; within two years of the fall of the tyranny the trend was put into top form by the democratic constitutional reforms of Cleisthenes in 508 B.C. No longer a country town either economically or politically, by the end of the sixth century Athens was ready to step out—and one need not seek far for modern analogies.

Athens had developed thus far within that framework of Greek city-states which we have noticed. But in 499 B.C., by sending twenty ships to help the Ionian Greeks burn the Persian city of Sardis, the Athenians deliberately trespassed upon another world, the Far Eastern sphere of influence. This meddlesome act was doubtless justifiable as a reprisal for the Persian capture of some strategically important Athenian colonial plantations near the Dardanelles, but it also displays more than a modicum of the spirit of exuberant mischief too. King Darius duly resented it and sent a punitive expedition which the Athenian militia thrashed on the historic plain of Marathon in 490 B.C. In 480 B.C. Darius' son, King Xerxes, returned to avenge the defeat and the disgrace. The nature of the Persian threat and the Athenian taste for salt water combined to make it logical that by this time Athens should have become the ranking naval power in Greece; and all the world knows of the spanking which the Athenian navy gave to the powerful Persian fleet at Artemisium, the shellacking which they and their allies administered at Salamis shortly after, and the finishing touches which they put on at Mycale in 479 B.C. Concurrently Leonidas of Sparta stood off the Persian Immortals for two days at Thermopylæ until treacherously outflanked, and the Spartan Pausanias annihilated the army of the Persian general Mardonius at Platæa in the following year. The Great King never came back in arms against free Greek burghers again. But in their own eyes these victorious Greeks were not really Greeks; they were Spartans and Athenians and Corinthians and so on. The Victory Monument of Platæa was inscribed with the names of thirty-one separate participating sovereign "United Nations." Broadly speaking, each contingent participated by vote of a separate legislative assembly—and there were many other states which sent no contingents.

In spite of some pretty narrow margins of safety, the city-state system worked so conclusively against the Persians that one cannot criticize it as a military measure of defense against a non-Greek invader. In other respects, too, no great harm is traceable to Greek particularism

prior to the Persian Wars. The galaxy of city-states with their separate patterns of thought, politics, economies, alliances, and feuds seems to have been a natural development. In the same way one would not quarrel with the fully developed national pattern of the last decade of the nineteenth century and the first decade of the twentieth. The Franco-Prussian War, the Boer War, the Spanish-American War, the Russo-Japanese War, the Italo-Turkish War, the Balkan Wars: these were regrettable enough, but like their counterweight, the Hague Tribunal, they were logical in a world consisting of individualized nations which had evolved into a generally accepted pattern. But sometime before 1914 a new element intruded into the world picture, and sometime between 479 and 431 B.C. the Greek world also reached a new stage, to which epoch and its gloomy aftermath we now turn.

The defeat of the Persians loosed tremendous energies all over Greece, particularly at Athens. The mass elation was something like that of Elizabethan England which not merely enabled the defeat of the Armada but was also in turn stimulated by that success. It had its similarities to that spirit which could also be detected in Hitler's Germany in 1939. The impossible had been achieved; the world was theirs for the taking; the heritage awaited. In the literary field the Athenians gave to posterity their incomparable tragedies and the histories of Herodotus and Thucydides; in architecture the jewels of the Acropolis; in sculpture the Elgin marbles. Every common article of household utility was a masterpiece of the most exquisite art. And this expansion of the creative mind and of the soul, reflected also in the extension of philosophical speculation (all of which the Germans of the 1930's completely missed!), was only a token of other expansion along military, naval, economic, and diplomatic fronts. A summary of this marvelous fifty years is "Irrepressible Expansion."

Solon's rape of Salamis was now a century old, and Peisistratus' territorial expansions were also "dated." After the Persian Wars a new aggressive policy was needed. Under Athenian leadership Aristeides the Just organized a mutual-protection alliance among the islanders, just in case the Persians should try again. Perhaps Athens was ingenuous at first, but the league had too many possibilities to be allowed to remain in this naïve form. We moderns can well understand how, little by little and at times almost imperceptibly, frequently with the concurrence of the members themselves, this alliance was transformed within a generation into a sinister empire. Once a state had joined, it could not secede; if it revolted, it was frankly beaten back into line and Athenian colonists were settled on its lands; annual contributions ostensibly for common defense eventually went into the Athenian city-state treasury; almost the entire

litigation of the league was settled in the Athenian municipal judiciary. All this development rested upon naval power, but during the same years Athens also conquered a complete land empire in central Greece. The latter was of less permanent significance than the former, but it was an actuality until 445 B.C.

The guiding personality during the culminating years of this expansion was the great Pericles. He is no mere two-dimensional silhouette moving across a historical shadow screen, but as real and personal an imperialist as Bismarck or Disraeli. Many of his dilemmas were also theirs, and they clamored equally loudly for solution; like them, he thought in terms of stark national realism. And yet his problem, though complicated enough, can be stated fairly simply after all. From the successive stages of Cylon, Draco, Solon, Peisistratus, Cleisthenes, and the heroes of the Persian Wars he had inherited a powerful, industrialized, democratic state which was great by any standard. In addition, the encouragement of immigration—most recently during the Persian Wars when man power was badly needed for naval construction—had produced overpopulation beyond the productive capacity of the land. Hence a dependable source of food and of raw materials, together with dependable markets for manufactures, was absolutely necessary if the commercial economy and democratic government of Athens were to survive—and on this last point there was naturally no debate among Athenians. It was no more possible for Athens to return to the primitive agricultural days of Theseus, Draco, or even of Solon (though some practical politicians actually did favor the attempt) than it would be for us to jettison our machine age in favor of some colonial horse-and-buggy formula. We wouldn't and the Athenians wouldn't; and neither they nor we could do it if we would. Solon's entering reforms, wise in their time, had seen to that; Peisistratus had speeded the trend; and in the decade of the battle of Salamis the creation of the Athenian navy had sealed the future of Athens. Time flows in only one direction, and the best that any man or nation can do is to accept the data and attempt to guide the relentless forward movement to its own advantage. Like many a modern statesman, both dead and living, Pericles attempted to do just that thing. He realized that it was useless to waste time over such small-change markets as the Greek islands; he could provide the necessary horizons for expansion by nothing less ambitious than a continental market in the whole new western world of South Italy and Sicily —a world which stood to old Greece in a relationship remarkably similar to that existing between Europe and the Americas. From the very start of his ascendancy Pericles shows a well-developed and fateful concept of *Geopolitik* which led his diplomacy in one undeviating direction,

namely, the consolidation of a naval lifeline to the West. In this he was aided by an already considerable trade with that area, but he was also hampered by the fact that Corinthian commerce had long since been entrenched there too. However, it is axiomatic that in such matters the question of precedence or established rights cannot be allowed to obstruct the necessities of progress. Thus when one modern historian writes that Pericles "hoped to compete with Corinth for the western trade," the implications of his understatement are frankly misleading; actually Pericles *had* to compete for Corinthian trade, and he had to get it. So all along the route Pericles commenced undermining Corinthian influence by an alliance here, by a strategically placed colony there, or by an excursion into troubled local politics at some third way station. Not to mention names, does not the recital of these causes and effects come home to modern readers?

Now for Sparta. Conservative and aristocratic Sparta had been right there all the time. Down in the Peloponnesus she had long since developed her own little show, a Spartan-dominated league of wide membership, including Corinth, and of very considerable power. Neither had Sparta's military prestige been in the least diminished by the Persian Wars. She was not personally concerned with commerce as such, and she lacked the nimble Athenian imagination to foresee what was up the wind, as Pericles knew perfectly well; but he also knew that Spartan inertia could not last forever and that sooner or later Athens would have to fight it out in a full-dress war with Corinth's great and good friend. As the Corinthian orators pointed out after Athenian high-handedness toward the Corinthian navy and Corinthian colonies had exasperated them beyond endurance, Sparta had either to fulfill her promises as self-appointed protector of her allies or else back down.

Not merely had Pericles foreseen the war, but he had also foreseen its strategy. It was common belief that Sparta was unbeatable on land; Pericles therefore planned not to fight on land but to evacuate the peasants from the undefended countryside into the well-defended city for the duration; this necessitated writing off the harvests of these peasants in advance, and subsistence on imported grain. Of course, food had been imported for decades already, but under war conditions the safety of the grain fleet was even more important, as we well know. Thus we return to the all-important navy, which Pericles built up and maintained on the Empire budget. But of course if I have undisputed control of the sea, then no one else can sail without my acquiescence, and sooner or later I shall perfectly certainly use my power in the abridgement of someone else's freedom. My motives may be impeccable and my pronouncements unimpeachably pious, but we know that passage of time

had not annulled the truth of the fundamental fact. And Pericles was not fooling.

The unvarnished and calculated realism of his policy is illustrated by an incident which almost precisely parallels the details of the German economic offensive against Rumania. The unhappy city-state of Megara, which had already made unwilling contribution to Athenian greatness, lay between the territories of Athens and Corinth, with harbors both east and west of the Isthmus of Corinth. Its diplomatic affiliations were with the Spartan circle, to which it had lately rendered some military assistance, but it had the misfortune of economic dependence upon Athens, to which city it exported garden truck and hogs. Both the motive, namely, a short cut to the western world without rounding the Peloponnesus, with punitive vengeance as a secondary motive, and the means of execution, namely, an embargo, were ideal for an economic squeeze. In the pursuit of his policy Pericles simply "excluded the Megarians from the markets and harbors of Athens and of the Empire" as Thucydides puts it, and the Megarians were ruined. A recent commentator remarks that this was "a declaration of war against the whole Peloponnesian Confederacy and was clearly made on the assumption that war was inevitable."

With this latter aspect of the embargo we may compare the German invasion of Poland in 1939, and in more general terms this kind of power politics smells remarkably like the jockeying prior to 1914 and the current War. The disastrous Peloponnesian War began in 431 B.C.; could it have been avoided? Surely the antics of Pericles and the defense measures of the opposition had long since ceased to represent the best interests of a mature civilization. Greek problems were real enough, but the Greeks might have cultivated a more adult attitude toward them.

Our synopsis of Greek history in some detail has had but one purpose, to demonstrate from the record itself that in the fifth century before Christ Greece needed a Penn, a Jefferson, or a Mazzini rather than a Pericles, a man to realize that unless the nations reorganized their whole pattern of thought the only possible end result would be suicide and mutual extinction. Had Pericles made it his lifework to unite continental and insular Greece into one nation comprising roughly the territory of modern Hellas, perhaps including even Greek Italy and Sicily, then much subsequent history would have been very different. Not that he should have compelled unification into an enforced New Order *à la Hitler,* nor have clubbed his world into an "Athenian Century"; he did try this and it failed. But if he had endeavored to form a voluntary and more perfect union of his world, he might have succeeded or made it possible for others to. At any rate, the potential result would have justified the effort. But Pericles saw things more conventionally and adopted

the time-honored course of building up for a world war against a reluctant Sparta, which it must be admitted had already allowed him to get away with a great deal. The clear intent was to put all other nations by land and sea under the ultimate domination of his violet-crowned Athens.

Athens and Pericles are not blameworthy by either ancient or modern conventional standards. Granting the pattern of world organization which we have sketched, which is also our own in all its essentials, there was not much else for him to do. Leaving aside all the charges and countercharges, the allegations of broken faith on both sides, all the "you're another" talk which every European knows by heart, all the dust in the air and the white paper with which one belligerent attempts to cast all the contumely and all the odium upon his enemy, the plain fact is that Athens was a sovereign state which needed, by standards which we are in no position to criticize, to expand at the expense of other sovereigns. After the preliminary démarches short of war had been exhausted, the ultimate resolution of this impossible situation was war, just as it always has been and still is.

The Peloponnesian War lasted from 431 until 404 B.C. when Athens was beaten and supposedly disarmed. The Spartans installed a Quisling government under the aristocratic Critias; after a few months of mass executions and hated misrule this government fell before the onslaughts of "nationalists." And Spartan military occupation was a flat failure elsewhere too. It was quite apparent that once more the liberators were enslavers, with only the difference that Sparta instead of Athens occupied that unenviable role. The international confusion had not been channeled into a new and purposeful direction at all; on the contrary it was even more at sixes and sevens. This, of course, is not surprising, for wars regularly raise new sets of problems which call for more wars to settle them.

Greek political and military history instructs us on the fate of a world dedicated to plural sovereignties. But Greek sociological and psychological history reveals a point at which the state disintegrates within itself. The indications are open to more subjective interpretation than those which we have discussed, and they apply to our world with somewhat varying persuasiveness; yet they strongly suggest that regardless of whether Greeks or moderns enlarge their political concepts or not, at any rate the old concepts are obsolete primarily because the general citizen interest in making them work is insufficient to motivate the necessary sacrifices and efforts. A partial list will illustrate the point.

After the death of Pericles the Athenian people tolerated an increasingly demagogic quality of leadership, and Athens was not the only state which deteriorated thus. Concurrently we also see cynical betrayals of

public confidence by such men as Alcibiades, whose behavior reminds us of recent instances in more countries than one. We can furthermore distinguish a declining respect for law and order. We see a professional military class arising. More particularly in the fourth century, we see an increasing tendency to place personal profit above the common welfare, exemplified by various forms of profiteering in both peace and war. We see debasements in æsthetic taste. We see the rise and swift popularity of vocationalized education or sophism, the pushing junior half brother of philosophy. We see the Athenian people pass a death sentence on Socrates. Everywhere we see the most impudent and cynical denial by word and deed of all the virtues of truth and fair dealing, not merely by individuals but also as instruments of national policy. Throughout that whole disordered world we see a longing for stability and a series of wearisome, destructive, and foredoomed attempts to combine it with national recovery, national aggrandizement, national military preparedness, revenge for past national humiliations, and the exaltation of national individualism. The body politic may survive by some decades the first infections, but eventually even the healthiest outward constitution will succumb. It is not censorious moralization, but sheer realism, to observe that the insidious tendencies which we have noticed are more than matters of individual taste and conduct; historians know that they are a broad threat to the whole civilization.

The most telling of all the forces sapping nationalism was *stasis,* or domestic partisan strife. Greek individualism ran wild within cities as well as between them. The governmental formulæ of the various cities were by no means the stable affairs implied by our word "constitution." Ever since commerce and industry had intruded into the agricultural municipalities the *demos* or proletariat had been attempting to better its position at the expense of the oligarchic party of wealthy and aristocratic grandees. The issue recalls the modern *stasis* of France in 1793, of Russia in 1917, of Spain in 1935, and, from a slightly different point of view, even of the United States in 1861. Greek *stasis* was doubtless logical, though regrettable, as part of a greatly disturbed economy in which money itself, to say nothing of industry, was a newcomer. From many points of view both sides deserve blame, and yet we can understand both positions. The resulting strife was bad enough back in the seventh and sixth centuries when the lyrics of many aristocratic poets reflect social unsettlement and competition for power, just as the more democratic *Piers Plowman* and the Peasants' Revolt grew out of a changing social condition in fourteenth-century England. But eventually, especially during and after the Peloponnesian War, oligarchic and democratic partisanship was carried to increasingly suicidal extremes. Almost every

city was incurably divided against itself. We have seen that at Athens Critias was happy to be the executioner of his fellow citizens as Sparta's *Gauleiter*. The historian Xenophon preferred expatriation in the more congenial aristocratic atmosphere of Sparta to life in his native democratic Athens. Every city was full of political exiles plotting return to their home states, seizure of power through foreign assistance, and massacre. No race has ever known the horrors of civil war so intimately nor portrayed them so vividly, as did the Greeks.

> The Milesians fell into misfortunes because of political factions; for the citizens, not loving equity, destroyed their enemies root and branch. The rich and the populace formed opposite factions. At first the democrats got the better and drove out the rich men; they gathered the children of the refugees onto some threshing floors and had them trampled to death by a lot of oxen. When in their turn the rich men got the upper hand, they smeared over with pitch all the democrats whom they got into their power, and so burnt them alive.

Such incidents could be multiplied time and again from all the Greek writers and from the history of almost every Greek city, large and small; but the most famous analysis of all, still reeking with bloody freshness, is worth repeating at some length. After describing the ghastly sedition at Corcyra in 427 B.C., Thucydides continues:

> In every city the chiefs of the democracy and of the oligarchy were struggling, the one to bring in the Athenians, the other the Lacedæmonians. . . . The dissatisfied party were only too ready to invoke foreign aid. Thus revolution brought upon the cities of Hellas many terrible calamities, such as have been and always will be while human nature remains the same. . . . In peace and prosperity both states and individuals are actuated by higher motives, because they do not fall under the domination of imperious necessities; but war, which takes away the comfortable provision of life, is a hard master. . . . The meaning of words no longer had the same relation to things. . . . Reckless daring was held to be loyal courage; prudent delay was specious cowardice; moderation was the disguise of unmanly weakness; to be thoughtful in meeting every issue was inactivity. . . . The lover of violence was always trusted, and his opponent suspected. He who succeeded in a plot was deemed knowing, but a still greater master in craft was he who detected one. On the other hand, he who plotted from the first to have nothing to do with plots was a breaker up of his faction and a poltroon who was afraid of the enemy. In a word, he who could outstrip another in a bad action was applauded, and so was he who encouraged to evil one who had no idea of it. The tie of party was stronger than the tie of blood, because a partisan was more ready to act without asking why. . . . The seal of good faith was not divine law but fellowship in crime. . . . Revenge was dearer than self-preservation. Any agreements sworn to by either party, when they could do nothing else, were binding for the moment only, when they had no strength from other sources. But he who on a favorable opportunity first took courage and struck at his enemy when he saw him undefended, had greater pleasure in the perfidious aspect of his act than if it had been open revenge. He congratulated himself that he had taken the safer course, and also that he had overreached his enemy and gained the prize of superior ability. . . . The leaders on each side used specious names, the one party professing to uphold the con-

stitutional equality of the many, the other the wisdom of an aristocracy, while the real prize was the public interests, to which they were nominally devoted. Striving in every way to overcome each other, they committed the most monstrous crimes; yet even these were surpassed by the magnitude of the revenges which they pursued to the very utmost, . . . both sides alike making the caprice of the moment their law. . . . Neither faction cared for religion; but any specious pretense which succeeded in effecting some odious purpose was greatly lauded. And the citizens who held an intermediate position fell a prey to both sides. . . . Thus revolution gave birth to every form of wickedness in Hellas. The simplicity which is so large an element in a noble nature was laughed to scorn and disappeared. An attitude of perfidious antagonism everywhere prevailed; for there was no word binding enough, nor oath terrible enough to reconcile enemies. Each man was strong only in the conviction that nothing was secure; he had to look to his own safety, and could not afford to trust others.

The ideological grouping of our world into totalitarian and democratic states does not in all cases follow precisely the same lines of cleavage as it did among the Greek oligarchs and democrats, although the effects of the industrial revolution are discernible in both, and there are other striking similarities as well; but at least it is true that a man of 1943, like a Greek of the fifth and fourth centuries, is known primarily by his partisanship rather than by his nationality. As a recent article in *Fortune* expresses it, "The alignment in this war cuts through traditional sentimental allegiances, and never before has a conflict between nations had so many distinct traces of an international civil war." The writer is absolutely correct except in his statement that it never happened before. But when nations no longer command the allegiance of substantial proportions of their citizenry who transfer their loyalty to some political gospel from over the border, and when the world of ideas commences to undermine the world of inherited national patterns, then the nations and the nation system which they represent are doomed.

Of course *stasis* has not reached the pitch of intensity or prevalence in the modern world which it reached in the Greek, and we can only pray that it does not. Yet we have personally seen comparable examples in Russia and Spain, and we frankly anticipate the moment when the task of the United Nations will be made easier by the turning of Germans upon Germans and of Italians upon Italians. The sum of human happiness would not be greatly increased if the citizens of these two nations were to start murdering each other, but nevertheless that is what most expediently-minded persons hope for.

Even apart from the instructive Greek analogy it is time for some serious thinking on the following questions: Is not the modern sovereign nation as a governmental form inadequate to the tasks of governing all its citizens, and especially to the paramount task of conducting its for-

eign relations in such a manner as to avoid periodic wars? Is not the nation-state an obsolete concept? Is it not time to devise something else? The apparently inevitable affirmative reply is not conceived with any individual nation in mind although some are much closer to disaster than others, but refers to the whole system and political philosophy which nations represent.

If one wishes further evidence that the Greek city-state had outlived its usefulness after the Peloponnesian War, one need merely consider the futility of intercity life and strife down to the battle of Mantinea in 362 B.C. Nationalism was producing nothing but desolation. The Greeks were still grasping for stability, but their efforts were always along the old lines, and no one city or combination of them was strong enough to impose a permanent settlement, and no statesman ever devised a workable diplomatic formula. In the two decades between 387 and 367 there were seven peace conferences making formal attempts to deal with spheres of influence, disarmament, sanctions, and other broad modern-sounding questions, but they all failed; and the last of them had as its only excuse the informal interment of any further efforts. Thereafter it wasn't worth while even to talk or think. For example, the Greeks united in a disgraceful surrender of home rule, or misrule, when they accepted the peace that King Artaxerxes of Persia "sent down" in 387 B.C. in much the same spirit as prompted the proposal seriously made in 1941 that European disorder should be settled through collaborative American and Japanese diplomatic intervention. In this case, they signed the treaty and promptly broke it. Or again, the irrationality of the Hitler-Stalin deal of 1939 could be matched many times by the kaleidoscopic coalitions of the fourth century in Greece which had as their unvarying object the curbing of someone's power—usually Thebes's—but never a purpose which could be charitably described as constructive. The whole era has been well compared to our interwar period. The contemporary and highly competent critic Xenophon says of the battle of Mantinea, which broke the Theban power in 362 B.C., that no one knew which side had been victorious from even the military point of view; and as for general conditions, there was ten times as much chaos after the battle as before. Thus in the entire seventy years since the beginning of the Peloponnesian War, at the cost of thousands of lives and incalculable economic destruction, the whole Greek world had achieved absolutely nothing, and meanwhile the most elementary political values had become utterly meaningless.

But once more we must not blame the ineptitude and the failure upon any peculiarly Greek perversity. The delegates of the several states at the various peace conferences were representing sovereigns whose inter-

ests were diverse and largely antagonistic precisely because the states were sovereigns. The principle is easier to understand if one recalls that the federated North American colonies were also antagonistic to each other in a sense and to a degree which the individual States of our federal union are not. But diplomats representing sovereigns, whether cities or nations, are possessed of just one idea, and it is a very limited one—to concoct a sort of sieve which will exclude foreign nations from realizing their ambitions at the same time as one leaves the freest possible hand for one's self. This has always been the pattern of intersovereign dickering, and it always will be. And when sovereigns reach such a stalemate as they eventually and inevitably must—as Greece did in the fourth century, or as we have now—the traditional diplomatic horse trading is bound to fail. Some wholly new formula is needed; and since new formulas are very rarely accepted voluntarily, they are usually imposed in a most unpleasant way from outside.

For completeness, one must admit that during the later Greek period there were some attempts at broader thinking, even though they never got anywhere. At one of the peace conferences one Callisthenes, an Athenian general who deserves to be better known, made an intelligent suggestion emphasizing the community rather than the diversity of Greek interests. And Plato in his *Republic* realized that all Greece was of one household and that war between Greek cities was, in the words of the editors of *Fortune,* "an international civil war." While Plato does not accent Panhellenic unity, at least he idealizes the conduct of intra-Hellenic war and would elevate it above the level of war against the barbarian.

Another contemporary, the distinguished orator Isocrates, presented an honestly prepared and tangible blueprint, Greek unity through an all-out war against Persia, just as many persons have seriously proposed that the real enemies of our civilization are the Russian communists or the yellow race. It was unfortunate, but characteristic of his age and apparently of ours too, that he should predicate his gospel of Greek amity and peace upon a conflict outside the family. Anyhow, Isocrates' happy thought came to nothing. Doubtless people thought it was not practical. But later on the Greeks had bitter occasion to reflect that unity on any terms was the only thing that *was* practical, when the wily and hard-fighting half-barbarian Philip came down from the north beating some and corrupting others and eventually enslaving them all at Chæronea in 338.

In reviewing several centuries of our Hellenic past we have naturally made wholesale omissions. One of these includes the entire Hellenistic period after the death of Alexander the Great, a period which in some respects resembles our own more convincingly than do the epochs preceding it. Were we to examine this era in detail, we should find the data

somewhat changed but our conclusions only emphasized. No one would choose the world of the Hellenistic empires, which we should now call regional blocs, as an edifying model for our emulation. Even the two federal unions of the third century B.C., the Achæan and Ætolian Leagues which pointed answers to many of the problems of the Fathers of the American Constitution, would be too late and much too little for us. Their motivation was after all merely the prosecution of new wars for new causes against new antagonists, with the Romans as new allies invited into the old internecine arena. Even without the overwhelming modern evidence, the Hellenistic monarchies and the Greek Leagues are substantial refutation of those popular suggestions for postwar settlement which evade the fundamental question of sovereignty.

According to Aristotle the most perfect of tragedies is that in which the protagonist is overwhelmed through excess of some quality which in moderation is a virtue. This is indeed the tragedy of the ancient Greeks; their ruination was their own sense of independence and of rugged individualism. As one modern writer puts it, "The fatal weakness of Hellas, as of the modern world, was that neither statesmen nor citizens would brook the slightest limitation on the precious sovereignty of their state." Only in 146 B.C., when Mummius imposed the *pax Romana* upon Greece, did the citizens of that distressed peninsula stop fighting each other. They could have stopped at any time, and certainly there was ample reason for them to do so, but with that dogged insistence upon self-destruction in the hope of destroying someone else first, which seems to be a universal human failing, they refused to enlarge their horizons and thus to reduce their insoluble foreign problems to comparatively simple domestic proportions. As we pity the results of their limited vision we also fear for the consequences of our own. We should not be justified in hoping for a fate better than theirs, especially when we consider all the up-to-date ingredients which we have added to the hell brew.

Granting that nothing is impossible in this present crazy world, we may guess that the world's fusion into a single ecumenical state with no internal boundaries, and all that this implies, is very unlikely to come to pass within any predictable time. Nevertheless, until something of the sort does emerge we are destined to just the same wars and rumors of wars as the Greek world experienced for hundreds of years and as we have experienced for most of our lifetime.

THE MINISTER AS INTERPRETER

JAMES B. PRITCHARD

Crozer Theological Seminary

Both students and faculty of this or of any other liberal seminary are faced with a very real problem. We spend days here in company with great men of all ages. We gain some insights which are rich and satisfying for us. Alive to the very tip of our being with some new discovery in the realm of spirit, we go out to preach it to the people in the churches.

Then, alas, that insight, so full of meaning for us, does not seem to move the people in the churches. It is not what they want, some say. A few, there are, who are seeking some fresh truth of God; many are not. Who has not felt this frustration? Not only ears that hear not, but opposition and a clamor that all the shibboleths be mouthed. One wonders if he would not have been better equipped had he been trained to say convincingly the commonplace. Or is not the whole task of leading people into new appreciations of the God whose mercies are new each morning thankless if not impossible?

So the problem of interpreting or communicating a living faith in God to men of this generation is a very real one—as pressing as that of finding the truth for ourselves. This problem is not a new one. Some light I have found in the activity of a school of scribes we call by the name of glossators. These men were active in every age in the long process of the transmission of the Bible. A gloss is an explanatory word which was written into the text as it was copied, explaining some older material.

Of course for the historian glosses work havoc. His concern is for records which are a faithful representation of things as they were. But the despair of the historian may prove the good fortune of the historian of religion. For in the best sense the glossator is an interpreter, who, in the light of his own day, seeks to effect a meeting of the past and the present in a copy which may be used by his contemporaries. Glossators were not always antiquarians, nor typesetters, but prophets who were alive to the needs of their day, seeking some relevance in the past for the present.

A text might be found almost anywhere in the Old Testament. An example from the book of Judges will suffice to make clear the work of two generations of editors. If by a kind of literary X ray one looks at Judges 4 and 5, he sees three distinct layers, one upon the other. The Song of Deborah in chap. 5 describes the signal victory of Deborah and Barak over Sisera due to a cloudburst which swamped the enemy and to the daring of a peasant woman who murdered the fleeing Sisera with a stone

hammer. It is a dramatic tale suitable for storytellers before a rustic audience. It extolled Deborah and the brave woman who crushed the skull of the enemy with one blow. It was written about 1200 B.C.

Four centuries later it was retold—this time featuring a new hero. In this edition (chap. 4) the national god, Yahweh, is the hero. He it was who sent the rain and delivered Israel. He was responsible for the flight of the army and the general. So this ancient story was interpreted according to a philosophy of a theocratic state of which Yahweh was the head, the god of battle. The ancient story lent itself to this use by an eighth-century editor.

Two more centuries pass. In this short time the nationalistic dream had been shattered. Events had proved wrong the dogma of the invincibility of Yahweh and of his chosen people. The nation was no more. Gone were Samaria and Jerusalem. In the period of the Exile some editor salvaged the story and wrote an introduction to it affirming an entirely new philosophy of history. The same facts were used to present Yahweh as judge in place of warrior. He used the enemy to correct and chasten Israel. When Israel repented, Yahweh gave the chastened nation victory. But sin meant punishment; punishment was evidence of sin. So this ancient story of Deborah was once more interpreted according to a pattern which gave meaning to life in a time of exile and hope in a time of oppression.

Neither of these interpretations moves us today, because both have given way to new thought patterns which are more consonant with life as we know it. But the fact remains that there were men who sought to bring the past experience into focus upon the issues of the present in language which men might understand. So have glossators ever worked in the long search for truth as men needed it.

These men, like liberal minds of other ages, saw truth not as final, but as agglutinative, accumulative. They did not ask that impressive, but entirely irrelevant question, "What would Moses do?" We phrase a similar appeal to ancient authority in order to be a little less remote, "What would Jesus do?" The past was not final; truth for today was not necessarily lodged in a past, golden age. Their very willingness to alter ancient scriptures evidenced this attitude. The faith of their fathers, the nationalistic dogma based on the invincibility of Yahweh, did not suffice for the reality of the Exile.

Here is an essentially liberal principle. Interpretation is ever changing. New facts, new conditions are emerging. One cannot impose ancient dogma upon the new conditions without great violence. No, it is a deep insight to see in the Bible together with a nucleus of literary fact of antiquity a succession of interpretations of this data, each sufficient for

the day, but ever giving way to others which fit more exactly the needs in the changing scene.

This method suggests the method of interpretation found in that familar framework of the New Testament, "Ye have heard that it hath been said . . . but I say unto you. . . ." The authoritarian looks at some golden age in the past—Mosaic legalism, the New Testament church, the revivals of Moody and Sankey, the former pastor's method—and assumes that in that age truth was "frozen." The authoritarian assumes that with predictive foresight the prophets of that age looked ahead with a blueprint of today. Throughout the history of the Old Testament and the New there runs the work of men to whom this static wooden view was anathema.

One need not despise the day of former understanding when it has given way to better. How many men have made the decision to be ministers on a theology which they later discover is no longer valuable. A man may discover that by the strange working of Providence he was called to preach the gospel on the occasion of hearing a text which he has since learned does not appear in any of the best manuscripts. What is he to do? Retrace his steps? No! That experience, that decision served for that day of limited knowledge. Now let him seek out a reason, a vision of the work of the ministry based on the unfolding view which, by the grace of God, is his present heritage. Perhaps the great purpose we call God could only reach him through the channels of adolescent thought; now at this stage of insight, that purpose seeks to reach him with other compelling convictions. So does truth come, not in a final burst of inclusiveness, but by degrees. When I was a child, I thought as a child, but now that I have become a man—— Truth is accumulative.

Our foe, personally and in our ministry, is inertia. The static mind, so easily content with the explanations of the past, is like a rocking chair for our souls, giving comfort and a sense of motion, without moving at all.

I am reminded of an ancient but real battle which took place in the very territory over which American forces have recently fought in North Africa. It was a battle over the translation of a word! Nothing would seem to be more peaceful than Jonah's gourd. Yet this word in Jonah 4:6 almost lost for a bishop his congregation. It was shortly after 400 A.D. For several hundred years the Greek and Latin Bibles had called the thing which sprung up and shaded the prophet by a word which meant "pumpkin." It was a part of the authorized version of the Bible read in the churches. A brilliant scholar, Jerome, had a few years before gone to Bethlehem and had made a translation of Jonah from the Hebrew. In this new translation he called this miraculous plant "ivy." Let me quote an excerpt from Augustine, bishop of the area around Bizerte, to Jerome, the aged translator:

A certain bishop . . . having introduced in the church over which he presided the reading of your version, came upon a word in the book of the prophet Jonah, of which you have given a very different rendering [*ivy*] from that which has been of old familiar [*pumpkin*] . . . and has been chanted for so many generations in the church. Thereupon arose such a tumult in the congregation, especially among the Greeks, correcting what had been read, and denouncing the translation as false, that the bishop was compelled to ask the testimony of the Jewish residents. . . . What further need I say? The man was compelled to correct your version in that passage as if it had been falsely translated, as he desired not to be left without a congregation—a calamity which he narrowly escaped.

How strangely contemporary that sounds. Insert *Moffatt* for *Jerome* and *pastor* for *bishop,* and it would adequately describe the inertia of some church within a Sabbath day's journey from here.

The willingness to overcome this inertia, this false conservatism, I should like to illustrate by pointing to two widely differing movements, the Salvation Army and a branch of the Anglican communion. In both there is a willingness to make the criterion of the practice of religion its relevance to life.

The late Dean W. P. Ladd of the Berkeley Divinity School, a scholar in the field of liturgics, has collected a book of essays called *Prayer-Book Interleaves.* He speaks of a living God whose mercies are new every morning, and who has little regard for selfish and stupid habits—ecclesiastical or otherwise. In a discussion of the Anglican Prayer Book, a fixed form of considerable authority for most Episcopalians, he calls attention to the fact that its "great virtue is due to the fact that originally it was an adaptation of an older service to the needs of its own day." That adaptation was made 390 years ago. The same may be said of the Bible at any period at which we view it in its long accretion of material. This wise churchman has seen that mere stubborn adherence to a standardized form is but a sign of the lack of originality, the sure evidence of decay. This refreshing note from an eminent Anglican, who seeks to reform some of the outmoded practices of worship is from a great liberal tradition of interpreters obsessed with the accommodation of worship and religious belief to the needs of the particular age and people which they sought to serve.

A few years ago there was a shocking rumor that the Salvation Army had, on the policy of depriving the devil of a monopoly of the best tunes, used in its services a song, "There are no flies on Jesus." St. John Ervine, an authority on William Booth and on the Salvation Army, replied to a query as to the authenticity of this rumor that it was probably false. "But," said he, "supposing there had been such a hymn, what's wrong with it? Isn't 'There are no flies on Jesus' merely a colloquial rendering of Galatians vi, 7: 'Be not deceived; God is not mocked: for whatsoever

a man soweth, that shall he also reap'?" St. John Ervine goes on to call attention to the fact that we Protestants rejected Latin from our services in spite of its manifold advantages, such as its universality, because we wished to have them rendered in a language understood by the people. Well, although a hymn "There are no flies on Jesus" is not likely to move readers of the CROZER QUARTERLY, there must be millions of people to whom it instantly and more vividly than any other form of words expresses what Paul said to the Galatians.

The glossators—the interpreters all the way from the editor of the E document to General Booth—by their labor, should teach us that we are not going to find the answer to today's problems elsewhere than in our own particular present. Many bright beams of light may shine upon the present from many ages in the past, but this is a new day with a new truth emerging in all that is happening in and about us. Carlyle put it once: "A man has no right to say to his generation, turning quite away from it: 'Be damned.' It is the whole past and the whole future, this same cotton-spinning, dollar-hunting, canting and shrieking, very wretched generation of ours."

Some of us are called to interpret a past, a significant past, to men of this warring generation. If there is one note of finality to preaching in this day, it is not that the final word has been spoken, but that the resources of the great God were not exhausted in some past crisis of Palestine, but are new every morning. May such an assurance, the insight of good men who have used and re-used the Scriptures to interpret God to their own time, be our goodly heritage.

DISCIPLES OF LENTULUS

ROBERT E. KEIGHTON

Church of the Evangel, Narberth, Pennsylvania

George William Russell, Irish poet and artist, better known under his pseudonym Æ, is the catalytic agent of this paper. A catalytic agent, you will remember, is one that causes a change, while remaining unaffected itself. It happened this way——

One day at a book sale I bought a copy of *Æ's Letters to Mínanlábáin.* It was a collection of intimate and casual letters written by Æ to the late Kingsley Porter and his wife. Mrs. Porter, in her introduction to the letters says, "Perhaps the greatest interest in these letters lies in being able to follow the process of the creating of his new book, *The Avatars,* which proved to be his last work in prose." In the letter dated May 18, 1933, Æ writes to Kingsley Porter:

> My fantasy about Avatars is unlike the orthodox conception of an avatar which is a saintly archbishop with the power of working miracles. I say in my book that Avatars are more like divine poets who live out their own lordly imaginations, and that the real traitors in Christianity were not Judas and the priests but the eleven apostles who conspired not to speak about the laughter of Jesus who must have been gay at heart as all immortals were and who went to merrymakings and feasts.

I did not know *The Avatars,* and apparently neither did any of the several booksellers I asked about it. Finally one volunteered to get it for me if it were still in print. It was. Eagerly I began to read. On page 63—the poet is speaking to Paul on Midsummer Eve—I found this:

> Something is going to happen, Paul. What is it? Is a new religion to be born? What magic will it exercise over us? I hope it will be the magic of the Gay. Are they not terrible in their sadness these religions of the Iron Age? The Light is never hailed with joy. "The Light shineth in the darkness and the darkness comprehendeth it not." "He came to His own and His own received Him not." The mystery is told in tears as if we must understand sorrow better than joy. The real betrayal of Jesus was not by Judas but by the other apostles who would not speak of the laughter of Jesus, He who went to feastings and merriments, gay at heart as all must be who know their immortality. I pine for something gay and beautiful. I swear to you, Paul, I want to wear cap and bells before the Throne, to clash cymbals and dance, not abase myself before the Lord with my nose in the dust and my hinder parts pointed to the heavens like crawling saints in the religious pictures.

Again, as I had done when reading this idea in the *Letters,* I put down the book and sat for some time thinking. "The real traitors in Christianity" and "the real betrayal of Jesus"—were they truly those who denied laughter to Jesus? Certainly joy must be a part of religion and of Christianity; but "the laughter of Jesus"—what about that?

A concordance of the Authorized Version informed me that "to laugh" occurs twenty-six times in the Old Testament and that "laughter" occurs seven times. In the New Testament the count is only five and one. (In passing, it may be remarked, the word "smile" does not occur at all.)

Examination of the occasions where the words are used shows that, with one possible exception, it is not the laughter of humor, but of scorn or derision or contempt. That single exception is in Luke 6:21 "Blessed are ye that weep now, for ye shall laugh" and its reversal in verse 25. I say it is only a possible exception, for I should not wish to argue the point. The use of the word in these two verses suggests rejoicing rather than humor; I might even say, and without overstatement, *instead* of humor.

Beyond providing a mere factual statement that is statistical and relatively unimportant, this discovery does not seem to offer anything interesting, unless it be merely that the conspiracy of which Æ spoke might be extended to include the whole Bible. Far more important is the problem of whether or not Jesus had a sense of humor. If he had, did his disciples hide the fact, either inadvertently or purposely? Are we right in ascribing such an alleged absence of humor to the disciples at all? Might it not be laid rather at the feet of the evangelists, those who wrote and compiled the gospels? Succinctly stated, Does the Jesus of the gospels emerge as a man with a sense of humor?

So expressed, the question of a search for the humor of Jesus is, paradoxically, both relieved of the burden of probing to its source a given sentence in the gospels—or even being interested in such a probe—and, at the same time, charged with the distinct necessity of recognizing the problem of the source of our inference. That is, if we are concerned merely with whether or not the Jesus of the gospels is represented as a man with a sense of humor, we do not need to pay attention to the problems of authorship or editorship or literary criticism. If we are about to offer an affirmative answer to the question, however, we must then be prepared to decide how far behind our present gospels our judgment will hold true. In brief, the Jesus of the gospels may be characterized as a portrait, a palimpsest, a mosaic, a composite, or any other analogy consistent with critical judgment. Our question is merely, Does this Jesus evidence any humor? What Æ says is that the disciples conspired not to speak about the laughter of Jesus. In the broad sense in which we are taking that statement, any evidence of humor on the part of the Jesus of the gospels will be sufficient to refute it. If we do discover such a sense of humor, we cannot be content merely with saying,

This is humor. There follows the imperative and imperious Why? and equally the Who has the sense of humor?[1]

Probably at this stage in our religious development and thinking it is not worth while to direct even a moment's attention to a likely charge that such a query is sacrilegious. More profitable would be a definition or description of what we mean by "humor."[2]

By humor we certainly do not mean "being funny" or indulging in jokes or given to the comic. Humor is much more serious than that and has its roots deeper than the superficial lightness of mirth and gaiety. Humor itself may not necessarily be a serious matter, but the discovery of its elements and character demands serious attention. Such a characterization must be our first concern.

Humor is first of all intelligence exercised as a controlling power. It is not the abandonment of the self to a situation. It is not unbridled release that allows one to think or behave with absolute freedom. Humor is a form of that higher freedom that is the result only of discipline. It is an apparent freedom from a situation that is really possible only because the individual is, perhaps even unconsciously, aware of hidden resources and powers. Humor is a sense of safety in the presence of the unusual. Humor is patience born of confidence and security, a mood of unwillingness to be disturbed by the strange or the obviously fearsome. There is a restrained but dignified objectivity—even to one's own self—that permits one to retain one's balance and equilibrium because of a sense of proportion. Philosophically, humor is the operation in thought and action of the doctrine of the mean—nothing in excess. Humor is tolerant toward others' failures or aggressive exaggerations. Humor refuses to be hurt by the revelations of one's own weaknesses or absurdities or belligerent trivialities. Humor is patient and kind. It is not envious or boastful. It does not put on airs. It is not rude. It does not insist on its rights. It does not become angry. It is not resentful. It is not happy over injustice, it is happy only with truth.

With all this in mind, I do not feel that it is a light question to ask whether Jesus was a man with a sense of humor. The search for this truth is not a facetious one, artificially attractive, deceitful in its promises,

[1] This is by no means to be taken as due to ignorance of or disregard for the whole body of New Testament criticism; it is merely the statement that in our present concern we are admittedly dealing only with the finished literature. It is as though one were to inquire, "Is there any green coloring in this portrait?" Either there is or there is not—no matter who applied the green or when it was applied or why. So with the "Jesus of the Gospels." In this finished portrait, as we have it today, is there any humor?

[2] There is such a thing as illustrative coincidence! At this point in my writing, I stopped, picked up a bookseller's catalogue that had just arrived in the mail, and, reading through the items, found this note regarding a copy of Jack London's book *When God Laughs and Other Stories* (1911) "First English Edition. Inscribed: 'Dear De Casseres: I had a real fight against all booksellers and book drummers, and therefore against my publishers, just in order to retain the title of this collection. Jack London.' "

rewarding only with meretricious results. Somehow I am too conscious of many hints I have read here and there, hints that are wistful and subtly hopeful.

For example. Lovable Dick Sheppard has a provocative little article called "God Has a Sense of Humor." In it he asks, "Why may we cry but not laugh in church, sing but not smile, look pompous but not pleased? . . . It is to me unthinkable that Jesus Christ, who told stories so charmingly, refrained from making children laugh, or that there was no playfulness in His speech when, for instance, He described the camel, hump and all, sliding unnoticed down the throat of the Pharisee. Did no one in the crowd smile?" In a recently published book[3] W. A. Smart asks:

> Is it unwarranted imagination to catch the suggestion of a smile on the face of Jesus as he replies [to Peter's question about forgiving seven times], "I would not say till seven times, Peter. You might some day be in danger of reaching that. Better make it seventy times seven. You will never reach four hundred and ninety times in this world"?

Frances Cole McLester in *Teaching in the Church School* states, "An essential quality each teacher should cultivate is that of being able to see the funny side of things. . . . In fact, knowing how to laugh and what to laugh at—including even ourselves!—may actually be one sign of being a Christian." Samuel Taylor Coleridge in *Table Talk* asserts that "No mind is thoroughly well organized that is deficient in a sense of humor." Henry L. Mencken, characteristically climactic, pronounces with awesome prophetic tones that a sense of humor "always withers in the presence of the messianic delusion." One might go on and on, being sure to include Lin Yutang's now famous formulæ:

> "Ideals minus Humor equals Fanaticism;
> Reality plus Ideals plus Humor equals Wisdom."

To be sure, any one of these may be segregated for individual dissection and analysis; but when they are viewed together—and with the recognition that these are only a few limited selections from a far larger stock of similar utterances—one is conscious that there is the wistfulness already mentioned. Of more importance is the imperious fact that one ignores their cumulative implications and challenge at one's own risk. We cannot deny that religion must include a sense of humor. There is also the haunting desire to believe that Jesus had a sense of humor; that otherwise he was only a great man who might have been greater had he possessed this invaluable asset of a full-rounded character. We are afraid that he will emerge merely as religiously eccentric.

[3] W. A. Smart, *The Contemporary Christ*, p. 95.

Several have undertaken to point out the wit and humor of Jesus. It is asserted, and rightly, that his wit was used to give light and not pleasure; that his sayings did not provoke laughter, but a keener perception of truth, often taking the form of epigram or apothegm; that these not infrequently passed over into hyperbole. The usual examples are those of the mote and the beam, the camel going through the eye of the needle, and other similar illustrations, equally well known.

For myself, there are two forms of the commonly accepted examples of the humor of Jesus with which I do not find myself in agreement. The first is such alleged examples of humor as the famous pun involved in changing Simon's name to Peter and the ensuing "upon this *rock* I will build my church." There would be no end to that sort of thing! Did not Simon—in its Hebrew form Simeon—mean "hearing"? Did not every proper name in the New Testament refer to something that could truly become a similar illustration of a sense of humor? The second is a recourse to Jesus' supposed use of what is called "Oriental exaggeration." If Orientals were commonly in the habit of talking in exaggerated forms of speech, then where is there any distinction when Jesus uses it? Why does it suddenly become humor? As well argue that because these words are being written upon a typewriter they are evidence of the fact that the writer is mechanically ingenious and inventively clever!

The only way any one may judge whether or not the Jesus of the gospels is a man with a sense of humor is to read and examine the gospels for the facts. So, to that task.

There are five types of material for which we may search:

1. that which might reasonably be expected to be said happily, with at least a smile;
2. that which might reasonably be expected to indicate a sense of humor;
3. that which is humorous to the modern reader;
4. that which indicates a sense of humor on the part of the writer;
5. that which indicates a sense of humor on the part of the Jesus of the gospels.

The distinction between 4. and 5. is based upon the answer to the question: Is the humor to be found in the words attributed to Jesus or in the gospel material other than his statements? Both are admittedly the work of the author or editor, but those to be assigned to the fifth classification are definitely put into the mouth of Jesus by the writer.

These five multiply and arrange themselves into what seems to assume almost the proportions of a geometric progression. I confess, at the outset, that a clear distinction between any two of them and their possibilities is a

Herculean task. Yet of all dangers, the greatest by far is that the judge shall read back into the gospels his own sense of humor, seeing in a perfectly serious occasion something so outrageously humorous that he sees nothing else. It is so tantalizingly easy to see humor where none is intended, to misjudge the spirit of the speaker or the reporter, to be so frantically eager to prove one's case that one's own consuming thirst creates the alluring but entirely subjective mirage that simply refuses to be seen by anyone else! The history of research is full of instances of that particular fallacy.

The first classification, those sayings that might reasonably be expected to be said with at least a smile, may be illustrated by "Be of good cheer: it is I; be not afraid" (Mark 6:50); or "Thy sins are forgiven" (Mark 2:5); or "Neither do I condemn thee: go, and sin no more" (John 8:11). These are, frankly, only personal implications and of relatively little importance.

In the second classification, those sayings that might reasonably be expected to indicate a sense of humor may be illustrated by "Can the children of the bridechamber mourn, as long as the bridegroom is with them?" (Matt. 9:15); or "Neither shalt thou swear by thy head, because thou canst not make one hair white or black" (Matt. 5:36); or "Neither do men light a candle and put it under a bushel, but on a candlestick" (Matt. 5:15); or others like "When thou doest thine alms, do not sound a trumpet before thee, as the hypocrites do in the synagogues and in the streets, that they may have glory of men" (Matt. 6:2); or "When thou prayest, thou shalt not be as the hypocrites are: for they love to pray standing in the synagogues and in the corners of the streets, that they may be seen of men" (Matt. 6:5); or "When ye fast, be not as the hypocrites, of a sad countenance: for they disfigure their faces, that they may appear unto men to fast" (Matt. 6:16).

The third group contains those sayings that are humorous as the modern reader thinks of them. First, however, there are elements of humor in the gospels apart from the sayings of Jesus. Is not the inclusion of Tamar, Ruth, and "her that had been the wife of Uriah"[4] a touch of genealogical humor? It recalls at once to my mind a word of Dr. Fosdick to his Riverside Church congregation: "I venture," he remarked to his audience, "that more than one family is represented here this morning who wanted to join the Sons or Daughters of the Revolution and so looked up their ancestors—and have kept still about it ever since."[5] Even the story of Jesus,[6] a boy of twelve—"sitting in the midst of the doctors, both hearing them and asking them questions. And all that heard him were astonished at his under-

[4] Matt. 1:3, 5, 6.
[5] H. E. Fosdick, *The Hope of the World*, p. 3.
[6] Luke 2: 41-52.

standing and answers"—reaches a climax that is possible of several interpretations in his retort, "How is it that ye sought me? wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business?" Most of the interpretations have for me the relieving touch of humor.

The more I examine the gospels for a sense of humor, the more I discover that this third group far outweighs all the others together in quantity. Moreover, I find examples grouping themselves under types of stories that, as a class, are almost always humorous.

There is that story of Jesus healing a cripple at Bethesda on the Sabbath (John 5). Forty-seven verses are required to relate the reactions of "the Jews," their distress and accusations, the reply of Jesus, their rising anger, his extended and repetitious explanations. In the eighth chapter of the same gospel Jesus enters into another long controversy with the Pharisees and the Jews, forty-seven verses again. The forty-one verses of the ninth chapter recount the intricate bio-theological problem of the man born blind. These three accounts were, without question, very serious to the author, the first readers, and many even of the present day, but I confess that I cannot read very far in any one of them without discovering that my own eyes are being opened by the salvation of humor.

Excuses are always humorous. When "a certain man made a great supper and bade many," the excuses of those he asked to be his guests are a source of unfailing humor. Further to illustrate this quality of the story, one should read on through the 28th, 29th, and 30th verses of the same chapter (Luke 14). The result of trying to build a tower without taking into consideration its cost has less humor, although still some, while the concluding account of the king preparing to meet an army larger than his own—obviously a part of the author's trilogy of emphases—is quite without any sense of humor at all.

This same difference in the way a passage is worded and related may be seen in the parallel accounts of the first three gospels as they recount the familiar incident of the rich man and the camel going through the eye of the needle. In Mark, when the disciples heard it "they were astonished out of measure, saying among themselves, Who then can be saved? And Jesus looking upon them saith, With men it is impossible, but not with God: for with God all things are possible."[7] Here the humor, if there be any at all, is latent with only a suspicion of its possibility. When Matthew uses the story, his "With men this is impossible; but with God all things are possible"[8] brings out the humor, while Luke's prosaic "The things which are impossible with men are possible with God"[9] has destroyed it altogether.

[7] Mark 10: 26-27.
[8] Matt. 19: 26.
[9] Luke 18: 27.

Little men, either physically or mentally, are sources of humor. Can we read the story of Zacchæus,[10] using any imagination at all, and fail to be amused by it? Or again, does not the steward,[11] suddenly confronted with the probable investigation of his none-too-sound stewardship and accounts, become little in his haste and his frantic attempts at acceptable readjustment? His whole conduct may give rise to ethical questions, but his ability to evoke a sense of humor in the reader can hardly be denied. So the little lives of little men who came to the house at Bethany, "not for Jesus' sake only, but that they might see Lazarus also, whom he had raised from the dead" (John 12:9), make for us a picture of all human frailties that expand themselves in the trivial curiosities and meangingless adulations of frothy souls.

It is easy to go on to other forms of human conduct that are humorous in the mind of the observer. The pietistic Pharisee's prayer in the temple (Luke 18), the ambition of James and John—or of their mother![12]—the caviling and captious criticism of the Pharisees already mentioned in John 5, 8, and 9—these are humorous. Even the story of Dives and Lazarus and the replies of the latter are relieved in my mind by a flash of this same light.

Men caught by a clever rejoinder or by a question cannot remain serious objects to the reader. When Jesus asked the question, "How say the scribes that Christ is the son of David?" and then gave an extended refutation of their view, Mark's conclusion is merely "And the common people heard him gladly."[13] In Luke's account[14] there is no reply of the people at all. Matthew, however, tells the story quite differently. They fall into a trap by answering another phrasing of the question with, "The son of David," in the refutation of which Jesus brings it about that "no man was able to answer him a word, neither durst any man from that day forth ask him any more questions."[15] We can only contemplate this resulting predicament with humor.

So are men impaled upon the horns of a dilemma. When the chief priests and the scribes and the elders asked Jesus by what authority he did "these things," they only discovered that they had better not attempt an answer to his retaliatory question.[16] In the same category should be placed the classic problem of whether or not it was lawful to give tribute to Cæsar.[17]

[10] Luke 19:1-10.
[11] Luke 16:1-13.
[12] Mark 10:35-45; Matt. 20:20-28.
[13] Mark 12:35-37.
[14] Luke 20:41-44.
[15] Matt. 22:41-46.
[16] Mark 11:27-33; Matt. 21:23-27; Luke 20:1-8.
[17] Mark 12:13-17; Matt. 22:15-22; Luke 20:20-26.

Still another humorous situation is that in which men are eagerly and painstakingly correct in their judgment of an abstract problem that is entirely objective to themselves, but pathetically and painfully ignorant of its purposed application concretely and subjectively to themselves. The overworked parable that Nathan told to David with its climactic "Thou art the man!" (II Sam. 12:7) is paralleled by the parable of the Good Samaritan and the word of Jesus "Go, and do thou likewise" (Luke 10:37), or by the reply of the disciples to Jesus' question about what the householder would do to his husbandmen for their treatment of his servants and his son (Matt. 21:41). It is of interest to see that in the story as told by Mark the answer is given by Jesus himself (Mark 12:9) and no reply at all is made by his disciples; when Luke uses Mark's material the reply is also given by Jesus, but to it the disciples merely say, unctiously, "God forbid!" (Luke 20:16).

Examples of the fourth group should include those that indicate a sense of humor on the part of the writer. After Jesus had healed the withered hand of a man in the synagogue, Mark remarks that the "Pharisees went forth, and straightway took counsel with the Herodians against him, how they might destroy him" (3:6). Later in the gospel[18] he writes, "they send unto him certain of the Pharisees and of the Herodians to catch him in his words." Did he see nothing—or intend nothing—more than a mere statement of the physical coincidence of these two parties, of whom common hatred had made another example of the strange bedfellows produced by polity? I can imagine that another comment of Mark is one of humor, as he reports the dismay of the disciples when Jesus warned them to "beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and of the leaven of Herod." The reasoning that arose among them, he writes, was, "It is because we have no bread."[19] Whatever else we may decide about the character of the story concerning Jesus and the Woman Taken in Adultery, it seems to me almost unavoidable that the writer produced one of the most genuine examples of humor in the gospels when he records that hearing Jesus say, "He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone," "being convicted by their own conscience [they] went out one by one, beginning at the eldest, even unto the last."[20]

Before presenting the last group of our five classifications, perhaps we ought to note what is at first sight a most astonishing and startling fact; *viz.*, that it is in the midst of the most tragic scene of the whole gospel story that there occur the only absolutely genuine and undisputed examples of humor in the gospels. A whole paper, I believe, could be written upon

[18] Mark 12:13; cf. Matt. 22:15-16.
[19] Mark 8:16.
[20] John 8:9.

the fact that in the stories of the crucifixion of Jesus occur the incidents of the cruel and crude humor of Herod, who "mocked him, and arraying him in gorgeous apparel sent him back to Pilate" (Luke 23:11); the equally crass behaviour of the soldiers, who "stripped him, and put on him a scarlet robe. And . . . plaited a crown of thorns and put it upon his head, and a reed in his right hand; and . . . kneeled down before him, and mocked him, saying, Hail, King of the Jews! And . . . spat upon him, and took the reed and smote him on the head";[21] and the final insulting mockery of the crowds at the crucifixion."[22]

The last type of possible humor in the gospel presentation of Jesus, that which indicates a sense of humor on the part of Jesus himself, is the crux of the whole matter. Here, if anywhere, we shall find the real answer to our initial question and the result of our initial search. Unless it were said in absolute anger and bitterness, then Jesus' characterization of "this generation" as "like unto children sitting in the market places, who call unto their fellows and say, We piped unto you and ye did not dance; we wailed, and ye did not mourn"[23] is genuine humor. Or again. The bewildering plight and consternation of the householder who drove out one devil, then "swept and garnished his house" with meticulous concern, only to have his recent guest return, see a condition of living far better than when he left it, leave, return, and finally take up permanent residence in the company of "seven other spirits more wicked than himself"—this story[24] leaves me quite willing to believe, with a smile, that "the last state of that man is worse than the first." And I do not feel that the humor is entirely mine; some part of it is in the telling of the story by Jesus.

Well, what now are my conclusions? First, the more I examine the gospels the more illustrations I find of humor, both in Jesus and in the authors. This is due, very probably, to my own eagerness to find humor and to my own reading into a situation or sentence the quality of humor that may not always be there. Second, Jesus, in the gospels, possesses a very real and lively sense of humor. Æ was wrong; neither the disciples nor those who recorded the material of early Christianity were successful in eliminating this quality from their portrait. Third, there is only one real, legitimate way of denying this conclusion concerning Jesus. That is to characterize him as a man of absolute seriousness, unvariable severity, obsessed and oppressed by an overpowering and consuming sobriety. To see him as such is so perfectly possible that one can find no fault with the assumption. It is one—probably of the same character as an unexamined

[21] Matt. 27:28-30; cf. Mark 15:17-19; John 19:1-3.
[22] Matt. 27:39-43; Mark 15:29-32; Luke 23:35-37.
[23] Matt. 11:16-17.
[24] Matt. 12:43-45; Luke 11:24-26.

and unconscious assumption that he *was* a man with a sense of humor—that leads us to find evidence of that fact in our reading. It is so easy to assert in our major premise the very thing we announce as "proved" in our conclusion.

Perhaps I ought to put it quite openly and frankly: it is not possible to prove beyond the shadow of a doubt and to the satisfaction of everyone either that Jesus did have a sense of humor or that he did not. It all depends upon an already preconceived determination of just that point. Then we go on to the search for favorable evidence. Alas! that very sentence—or conclusion—reveals to me the fact that I have let myself in for another study. In this one I have utterly failed to make any search for, or any attempt to illustrate, the fact that Jesus was a man completely without a sense of humor. Perhaps some of the things he said would prove that, too. Quotations of his anger or pronouncements of doom may be just that—a lack of any ameliorating or saving sense of humor. Perhaps when a man is angry he has proved that, for the moment at least, he not only is without any intelligent resources, but that he also is without a sense of humor.

Well, we have kept Lentulus out of the picture long enough. He is merely that apocryphal gentleman who wrote, in mediæval Latin of the fifteenth century, a letter of which no manuscript is known. As the "president of the people of Jerusalem" his letter "to the Roman Senate and people" begins, "There hath appeared in our times, and still is, a man of great virtue named Christ Jesus, who is called by the gentiles a prophet of truth; whom his disciples call the Son of God, raising the dead and healing diseases." Then he gives a physical description of Jesus that includes the words, "He is terrible in rebuke, calm and loving in admonition, cheerful but preserving gravity, hath never been seen to laugh but often to weep."

Shall we, or shall we not, become disciples of Lentulus?

EVIL AND GOD

HOMER H. DUBS

Duke University

THE FACT of evil has caused more people to doubt the existence or the goodness of God than has any other circumstance. They have assumed that a perfectly good and omnipotent God can produce only a perfect world. The notion that a good God can produce only good is, however, an ancient conception that belongs with the belief in a primeval golden age. Any empirical proof for it is impossible. It is quite out of harmony with the Christian doctrine that sinners are punished by a good God. Once we give up this assumption, it may indeed be possible to explain why God should have allowed evil to occur in a world containing human beings.

The problem of evil is a purely speculative one: On what hypothesis is it possible to reconcile the perfect goodness and omnipotence of God? If an omnipotent (though possibly self-limited) and perfectly good God did allow evil to occur, he must have done so deliberately, with due foresight of what might happen. But what could there be that would justify such a portentous event as God's permission for evil to occur in the world he plans? It must be something so good in itself that it outweighs all evil that occurs, as well as being a feature that could not be attainable without the occurrence of evil. Some persons may deny that anything can possibly outweigh the great mass of evil that has and will occur. Such a denial, however, can be only a dogmatic statement. I believe there is one feature that satisfies these requirements. It may not be congenial to many persons, for its postulation leads us to a temporalistic and indeterministic metaphysics different from the eternalistic determinism that is characteristic of so much modern philosophy, and that is even implied in much Augustinian and Calvinistic theology. We may, however, in a Socratic spirit set out this hypothesis and see to what it leads us: God allowed evil to occur for the sake of making possible thereby free human achievement.

Achievement, in its fullest sense, is not a simple concept. Human achievement is progress that has been caused, in the fullest sense, by human beings. Hence we must ask a preliminary question: What are the prerequisites for progress?

Progress is not mere change; it is a change for the better, an advance to a condition in which there is more good or less evil than previously. The continued absence of a desirable good is, moreover, an evil. Progress therefore presupposes some evil. The possibility of progress, moreover, presupposes the existence of evil—without original evil there could have

been no progress. Whenever we exalt progress, we admit that human life and the world were not originally perfect.

If there is to be progress, how much imperfection or evil must originally have been present in the world? The less such imperfection, the less progress there can be; the more evil, the greater the degree of progress possible. Then, if part of God's purpose is to enable man to progress greatly, he must deliberately have put a large degree of imperfection into the world, in order that great progress might be possible for mankind. If, moreover, progress is to be continued over long periods, then there must have been some imperfections or evils in the world that could be easily overcome, others more difficult, and still others so difficult that for long periods of time they may appear insurmountable, and whose conquest cannot even be begun until a vast degree of other progress has been achieved. It would also seem likely that, when certain evils have been overcome, others, which previously were latent, may appear. All these types of metaphysical evils may be expected if there is to be great progress.

There seems to be every evidence that the evils found in this world, now and in the past, are of the foregoing sorts. Certain steps in progress, such as the discovery of fire, the wheel, agriculture, and writing, while each of inestimable benefit to mankind, could yet be made before the beginning of history; others, such as the cure and banishing of disease or war, have come much more slowly and are yet far from completion. Still others, such as the mastery of the greater forces of nature, hurricanes, earthquakes, etc., seem at present impossible, yet their mere prediction (which is now only beginning to be possible) would remove much of their evil. Since science has already done so many seemingly impossible things, how can we be sure that the conquest of any evil will in the future be impossible? When certain evils, such as the lack of a food supply adequate to the needs of all human beings, have been overcome, other evils, such as economic depressions, have appeared. Evils aplenty are found in this world, but even natural evils are not out of harmony with God's plan.

Then what is suffering? Suffering is not only a sign that progress is necessary but, at the same time, the strongest possible stimulus to it. Without pain, human beings would make little progress. In the climatically favored equatorial islands of the Pacific, life has been almost static, whereas in the temperate zone a seemingly evil cold winter compels people to think of the future on pain of death by starvation, and so to progress. The surest evidence that mankind will continually endeavor to eliminate an evil is the fact that man suffers from it. The greatest difference between ancient and modern civilization is, indeed, that the ancients cultivated insensibility to suffering, whereas the progress of civilization has made man-

kind more and more sensitive. The Romans were hard; modern peoples are incomparably more sensitive—a war in Java makes people in New York suffer. The Roman empire fell because its people ignored the inadequacies of its social organization; the modern world may continue, only if we constantly suffer sufficiently from the maladjustments in society so as to be stimulated to correct and remedy them. Suffering is, then, one of the best things that happen to mankind. It is God's spur to progress.

Achievement is not a mere betterment of the world, which comes about when man does that which his nature or environment causes him to do. Such action is determined; it might bring about progress, but man would not be responsible for it. It would be God's achievement or the universe's achievement, not man's achievement. Human achievement requires that man should not be completely determined in his actions, that it should be possible for him to do deeds which his own nature and environment do not require him to do. In short, human achievement requires real human indeterminism. If a man's actions are all determined, even by forces within his own nature, that man merely performs what those forces preordain. There may be progress, but there cannot be any individual human achievement. I, as an individual, could not then add to the value of life anything which originates with me. I could only do that which the elemental forces acting through me predispose me to do. But if there are some really undetermined actions, it may be possible for me, as an individual, to add some value to the world, which value is not necessitated by any previously existing force or forces. Then I can myself really achieve something. The possibility of achievement requires real metaphysical free will.

When God gave free will to mankind and placed man in an uncompleted world, God shared with man his own creative power and gave man the opportunity of becoming a cocreator of the world with himself. What higher status could he have given to man! How better could he have shown the infinite worth of each human being! But the inevitable cost was great. Free will is necessary in order that man's success may be his own. But if God gave to man a real possibility of undetermined choice, he inevitably gave man also the possibility of failure. Without freedom, progress might have been continued and inevitable; there might have been no failure or sin. But metaphysical freedom, while it gave man the possibility of becoming a cocreator with God, also necessarily gave him the possibility of deviating from God's good plan and therefore of introducing evil into the world. Then the possibility of immorality and sin is the price God had to pay for giving to men the opportunity of rising to the high status of cocreators.

The actuality of immorality and sin is due, however, not to God, but

solely to man. Man was not necessitated to sin. Man was made to achieve knowledge as well as to use it. But in an imperfect world the free choices of a person who lacks knowledge of what is best are mostly chance events; hence a certain proportion of those choices are (by chance) evil. God can hardly, then, be responsible for human sin, since the choice of evil was neither God's doing nor was man put into a situation in which he inevitably chose evil.

Moral evils, which are due to man's choices, are clearly the worst evils he had to endure. War, crimes, injuries, avarice, etc. are then man's contribution to the world, not God's. God foresaw their possibility and provided the means whereby those moral evils could be eliminated—through the increase of knowledge (scientific progress) and the heightening of man's devotion to the good (development in religious earnestness). He also provided the stimulus which inclines (but does not necessitate) man to eliminate those evils, *viz.*, suffering. The possibility of moral evil was the inevitable concomitant of making man a cocreator with God, by giving him the possibility of achieving progress. It was a high price, but, in view of the gain, how can it have been too great?

Is evil then good? This is the objection raised against most theodicies. To us evil is good only in the same sense that a nauseating medicine may be good for a sick person. It would have been better had he known how never to have allowed himself to become ill. Without evil and suffering, man would not progress to be a cocreator; he would leave good enough alone. Evil occurs only in order that it may be eliminated. To an alert person actual evil is, moreover, not needed to keep him active; the threat of evil is sufficient. Then evil remains absolutely evil. Its elimination is man's greatest duty, even though God placed its possibility in the world.

It may increase our confidence in the foregoing account of the universe to note that man is utterly unsuited to a world which lacks evil. Man is an active being, who constantly desires success—the attainment of that which he lacks. Put him in an environment where there is nothing to be done except eat and sleep, and he quickly becomes bored. For such a situation mankind has invented games of various sorts, whereby artificial wants are created, that man may surmount imaginary obstacles, mimic catastrophes may impend, imaginary battles may be fought, in order that some success may be achieved. Gambling makes these invented failures or successes real and serious. Man is utterly dissatisfied without the recurring experience of success—and genuine success is impossible without the possibility of genuine failure. Man is made for an imperfect world. Heaven, imagined as a place where achievement is impossible because all wants are satisfied, is itself unsatisfactory. Animals are contented to eat and sleep; man is made for higher things: to succeed, or to fail. God not

only put man in a world where evil is possible, he also gave man a nature that is only contented when it can battle against evil and achieve success.

What sort of religion comes out of this conception of God and man? God can be accepted as a perfectly good being. This circumstance is very important for religion. God is man's ideal; hence he must be perfectly good. If God is partly evil, man cannot turn to him in full confidence and trust, but must always hold himself partly aloof. God can furthermore be conceived as continually working for good in the world—not compelling men to do right, but pleading with and aiding men, giving them knowledge and devotion. God is furthermore recognized to be in control of the world. He is self-limited by the laws of reason and by human freedom of choice, upon the latter of which God voluntarily does not infringe. Then man's success in the long task of perfecting this world is assured and the kingdom of God, when all men will voluntarily do his will, must sometime arrive. The assurance of such success is important for religion, since, without an adequate reason for believing that success can be achieved, mankind would hardly keep on struggling through long and painful years. Even dualistic religions, such as Zoroastrianism, themselves posit the eventual supremacy of the good principle. If they did not offer any hope of victory, man would compromise with evil, rather than fight it. We can, then, have faith that this world is God's world through and through, except as man has modified it. It may not be, in all respects, what we human beings would like, but even its imperfection is suited to our natures. Man can then be utterly devoted to God and yield himself completely to doing God's will, in confidence that thereby man's own greatest good will be attained.

For man, the religion arising out of the foregoing view is stimulating to the highest degree. We are led to the faith that man was not put into the world to enjoy it, but to remake it. Religion is not for the lazy or soft. It is a call to a war against evil that demands all of man's powers, generation after generation. We may "rest in the Lord," but only if that rest is the best way to gather strength for continued fighting. The most important task for the Christian is not merely that he himself should be saved; the true doer of God's will seeks also to save others. The elimination of all evil is the task which God has set for us, and, in that fight, we know that God is on our side, aiding us with all his powers, in so far as that is good for us. Then the religious life does not consist merely in preaching or even in social work. Anyone who helps to bring about any good whatever—scientist, physician, farmer, mechanic, teacher—is doing God's will in his ordinary occupation; thus this occupation becomes a religious life and demands the use of man's best intellect and endeavor. Religion spreads its shining robe over the whole of human life, as far as

man endeavors to do good, and urges him on to renewed efforts. Shall we ever need a substitute for war? Here it is. God has given man the opportunity to be a cocreator with him in fashioning the world.

Then why do we suffer now? In part we suffer because of our own sin. Wrongdoing has bitter consequences indeed. In part, we suffer because God deliberately refuses to suspend the operation of natural laws. If, under the same circumstances, God sometimes did one thing and sometimes another, man could not know how to act. If fire sometimes burnt and sometimes cooled, life would be such a confusion that man would be helpless. God must act uniformly in order to be reasonable and to give man the opportunity of learning how to deal with the world. Then if even the most beloved saint steps off a sheer precipice, he must fall to the bottom. God furthermore deliberately refuses to invade man's sphere of choice; if God, by his power, bent man to his purposes, he would thereby take away man's opportunity for achievement. God refuses to change natural laws or prevent human evil choices or their consequences. Thus all sorts of unfortunate accidents are possible. The death of a useful man in his prime often seems inexplicable and out of harmony with God's good purpose; yet it is merely one of those events that become inevitable when God makes man more than a puppet and refrains from interfering with his uniform laws.

In part man also suffers from the sins of others. A world war, for example, which arises because a few individuals are ambitious for power, spreads suffering over all mankind. If this fact appears unjust, we should remember the correlative fact—man's greatest goods and enjoyments also come from others. Education, civilization, progress of all sorts is possible only because one individual can affect others and transmit his own achievements to them. Animals cannot pass on their achievements, since they lack the power of communication. Man has that power—and suffers from it!—but the benefits he secures from communication with parents, teachers, friends, and society far outweigh his sufferings. Then man should be stimulated to improve, not merely himself, but all others. As long as any person anywhere fails to strive continually with all his might to do the right, we may all suffer.

Most of our suffering today comes from the failure of past generations to do all they could. Certain diseases, like malaria, could be eliminated today if only enough people would coöperate to fight them. But men still lack sufficient good will and earnestness. Suppose scientific medicine, instead of beginning only four centuries ago, had begun four hundred millenniums ago! How much could have been achieved; how much suffering, today inevitable, would have been prevented! If, three-quarters of a century ago, enough American Christians had been interested in making

Japan a genuinely Christian nation, this war would very likely have not occurred. Man suffers today because there is not enough social cooperation on the part of others nor enough knowledge available how to fight evils. But man has been on this earth long enough to have attained both these goals. We suffer now because in the past man has been lax; let us beware lest our descendants suffer for the same reason.

Because of human indeterminism, we cannot be sure that any particular generation or group will achieve success. As long as men deliberately make wrong choices, God does not prevent them from suffering the consequences of their deeds. Hence it is possible for individuals, nations, or races to go down in utter defeat unless they utilize the means of salvation God has provided. Life is indeed stern and hard; success is not for the indolent or careless. But, as long as men continue to suffer, that suffering itself leads them to seek a better way, until they find the right one and attain deliverance for themselves and others. If certain traditions and practices lead to the overthrow of the white race, as such practices did lead to the downfall of Babylon and Rome, then the black or brown races, if they are sensitive enough to learn from our failure, may yet succeed. This is God's world; his will must eventually triumph. From suffering comes salvation.

We need not then accept any metaphysical dualism or ultimate evil principle in the world in order to preserve God's perfect goodness. We may have faith that he is all-powerful and all-good. Because he, in his goodness, made it possible for man to raise himself to be a cocreator with him, he left this world unfinished, with many obstacles and evils. He also left man's nature undetermined, so that man might himself develop and train it, in order that man's deeds might be man's own achievements. Man is then no puppet in the hands of God or universal forces. In man's onward struggle, he who suffered for us all on Calvary, paying the price of an uncompromising fight against evil in high places, has been and will always remain the greatest creator of good, next to God. He must always remain our leader. God has set for man a long and hard road, but with it he has given man a nature that would be dissatisfied in any other sort of world. He has also given every man the prospect of continued and unutterable joy in furthering humanity's progress. At the end of that long road there is a goal of transcendent value that will satisfy all longings. Hardship and pain have been set as man's companions on the long history of the human race, but only for a completely good purpose. We may then accept the task that has been set for us, and give ourselves to achieving all that is possible in spurring onward human progress.

BRIGHTENING THE LONE STAR

RITTENHOUSE NEISSER

Crozer Theological Seminary

SIDE BY SIDE in the burying ground at Newton Centre, Massachusetts, lie the mortal remains of two men who had a vital part in one of the greatest movements in the history of Christianity. One was born in Boston and educated at Harvard and Andover; the other first saw the light of day in western New York, and secured his college training in two young schools in Iowa. One handled the tools of the writer and teacher; the other knew the use of the plough, the axe, and the surveyor's chain. One taught the enlightened to sing "The Morning Light Is Breaking"; the other awakened the benighted to the glory of the new day.

When the American Baptist Missionary Union met at Albany, New York, in May, 1853, it faced the question as to continuing its struggling missionary work in South India. A deputation which had visited the field made an unfavorable report, but a committee appointed to review the matter recommended that the Telugu Mission be continued and strengthened. On the evening when the matter came up for consideration a missionary map hung over the pulpit, on which the stations in Burma were indicated by a cluster of stars and the one in South India by one star only. In the heat of the debate some one pointed this out as the "lone star."

The next morning the question was again taken up. While the fate of the Mission hung in the balance a poem was read, composed during the night by Dr. S. F. Smith:

Shine on, "Lone Star!" Thy radiance bright
Shall spread o'er all the eastern sky;
Morn breaks apace from gloom and night;
Shine on, and bless the pilgrim's eye.

Shine on, "Lone Star!" The day draws near
When none shall shine more fair than thou;
Thou, born and nursed in doubt and fear,
Wilt glitter on Immanuel's brow.

Shine on, "Lone Star!" till earth, redeemed,
In dust shall bid its idols fall;
And thousands, where thy radiance beamed,
Shall "crown the Saviour Lord of all."

The effect was electric. A wave of conviction swept over the audience. The Mission was saved.

The poem was prophetic, but where was the man to bring about its fulfillment? He was in the making. On the anvil of circumstance the

hammer of experience was forging a man of iron with a heart of gold, able and willing for the task; and when Lyman Jewett, on furlough from Nellore, began the return journey to South India, November 30, 1864, he had with him John Everett Clough, the man of destiny.

It is not necessary here to recount the familiar story of the success of the Telugu Mission, from the arrival of Clough and his noble wife at Nellore, April 22, 1865, until his final retirement from active service in 1905. For the time being we are interested in the personal qualities and characteristics which made it possible for him to achieve such great results. Our information for this intimate study comes from his numerous diaries entrusted by his estate to the American Baptist Historical Society. One does not read far in these journals before he notes numerous evidences of Dr. Clough's concern for his growing family. Record is made of his letters to them and of theirs to him. Birthdays are noted, and mention is made of little items of interest in family life. During the first voyage to the East he writes, "Had to give little Allen a little spanking for spitting—thought it quite funny for some time"—the spitting, not the spanking.

On the last page of the diary for 1870 appears the English alphabet, roughly drawn as by a child, with the J turned backward, and after the final letter the word "dun." This was probably a task set by a fond father for his first born, often turned back to in later years; for when the Cloughs returned to India early in 1874, after a two years' visit to the homeland, the elder two children, Allen and Nelora, had been left behind in America. An entry made on June 1st of that year reads: "Good letters came this morning from dear little Allen and dear Nelly. . . . Nelly's letter was printed with a pencil, done . . . by herself, her first real letter." November 10th of the same year records the addition of another member to the family: "Baby—name unknown was born this morning at 8 o'clock. I trust that she will be a child of God, and leave the world better than she found it—better for her having lived. Goly and Warren are highly pleased. Goly's first question after I told her she had a little baby sister was, "Is it black? Is it really a white baby sister?"

On May 13, 1879, the Cloughs sailed again for America, this time with sad hearts, because it had been decided that Mrs. Clough should remain there to regain her health, impaired by years of toil in the unfavorable climate of southern India, and to make a home for the five children and Dr. Clough's aged mother. After they had reached England, a letter came from headquarters, insisting that Dr. Clough should return at once to India in order to look after the host of new converts there. On Sunday, July 6, the diary records: "Reached Gravesend about 4 P.M. Had to bid good bye to dear wife and children. . . . I went ashore . . .

and before I got to the hotel the *California* had gone with all that was dear to me in London."

Throughout the journey back to his post of duty his family was on his mind. At Suez he notes his intention to write to Allen and urge him to be careful in handling his gun. Two days after arriving in Madras, he made the following record, marking it *"Notice!!!"* in bold letters on the margin: "Deposited with Messrs. Parry and Co., on one year's time at 5 per cent Rs 2000. This is *Private funds*, mine personally, or *for Wife* if *anything happens to me.*"[1]

A week later, August 16, 1879, he reached Ongole and the next day wrote: "18 years ago to-day Hattie and I were married. How quickly the years have gone. I thank God for all the good He has done us. His mercies have been many. We cannot be thankful enough. Our lives and the lives of all the dear children whom He has given us have been spared and other blessings without number."

Another revealing entry appears in the following month: "Put the little immitation gold shirt bosom studs bought by Allen . . . for the first time into my shirt this evening." Evidently they were then shown proudly to a fellow missionary, for he continues, "Mr. Boggs thought them nice." A little later he jots down a number of things he expects to include in a long letter to this same son. "What I want him to do: (1) Get a No. 1 + 4 + 7 education. Be a first class man. (2) Must not think of coming out here now. (3) How to help his Papa. Help Mama, sisters and brother; shun all bad and godless companions and Society except once a month or once a term. Keep at home—love it, make it pleasant and stick to his books." November 27, 1879, he records, *"Wrote my Will. Gives all to wife.* Bro. and Sister Boggs witnesses." The diary for that year ends with an itemized account, which is summarized as follows: "Money paid on acct. of Hattie and chicks during the year ending this day—$1400."

As has already appeared, the pages of Dr. Clough's diaries bear witness to his warm and sincere Christian faith, manifested by many spontaneous expressions of dependence and hope. Such an entry is found on September 17, 1866; "Arrived in Ongole just before sunrise—Oh may the Lord bless our coming and our stay to the salvation of many. As the darkness has given way to day this morning so may heathen darkness give way and recede before the glorious light of the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ." On the last page of the diary for 1869 appears a statement of the number baptized in that year, 573, followed by this pæan of praise: "To God be *all* the Glory—now and forever. 'Be still and know

[1] Punctuation, capitalization, and spelling are printed as they stand in the diary in this and subsequent citations.—THE EDITOR.

that I am God. I will be glorified among the heathen, I will be glorified in the earth.' Psalm 46:10."

In 1877 Dr. Clough was serving as agent for famine relief in the Ongole district. On Saturday, November 3 of that year he writes: "On the 25th ult. I asked the General Famine Committee, Madras, to grant us Rs 25,000 for this section. To-day judge of our surprise when I received Transfer cheque on the Treasury, Nellore, for no less than 50,000 Rupees ! ! Thus has Jesus always given more than our weak faith ventured to hope for."

A saving sense of humor characterized this missionary, even as an apprentice. Evidently travelers in that early day carried at least part of their provender with them. On the first voyage out, the diary for Saturday, February 4, 1865, "Kill the white pig, save the other until another time before he is sacrificed to the shrine of our apetites." After he had been on the field a little more than a year, a native to whom he had written a letter sent it back because he was offended at not having been given a title. Next day, June 3, 1866, the journal entry reads: "I conclude that hereafter I shall have no titles." May 5, 1867, makes record of an important event: "This morning preached my first regular sermon in Teloogoo, from Job 21:15. Who is the Almighty, etc.—just 2 years from the day I commenced studying Teloogoo. The sermon ought to have been a good one as it was one hour and twenty minutes long."

As has many another, Dr. Clough found what he had learned through his early experiences of great value when he came to face the principal work of his life. Trekking from state to state as a youth prepared him for his many journeys in India. His brief periods of employment at a hotel and in a general store taught him how to look after strangers and dispense commodities. His knowledge of farming and of handling stock stood him in good stead in his agricultural work. His experience as a civil engineer and the fact that he had an official certificate as a United States deputy surveyor made it possible for him to secure the contract for a section of the Buckingham Canal, and so provide sustenance for hundreds of native Christians during the terrible famine of 1876-1877, which is said to have cost 3,000,000 lives. His struggle with poverty as a student gave him the understanding necessary to cope with the poverty of students in India. His year of school teaching, his period of service as colporteur in northern Iowa, his knowledge of law and politics—all these were valuable parts of his equipment. No wonder the natives were willing to admit "this *dhora* [white man] could have earned food and clothes if he had stayed in his own country and his religion therefore could not be worthless."

By the time Dr. Clough had spent a few years on the field he had

come to have some definite ideas as to the principles which should govern his endeavors. These are set forth at the beginning of his diary for 1869: "The Elements of Success: (1) A Consecration to the work; (2) *A determination to do whatever is duty,* though the heavens fall; (3) Act for the present time only; (4) Never surrender a general principle. Find out what is *right*—what *is truth,* and *then go ahead*; (5) For *knowledge* of men and of the *mind* of *man study the Bible*—particularly *the New Testament;* (6) Remember—the secret of a life of usefulness is *A life of prayer*—a reliance on Jesus."

The opportunity of attending a theological seminary had never opened to John E. Clough. Perhaps this was providential, as almost any seminary available to him might have given his ideas a fixity which would have interfered seriously with his remarkable work as a missionary. In his entry for October 29, 1875, he outlined his opinion as to what constituted an educated man: "(a) A man of large, wide views, who can see all sides of questions, etc.; (b) A man who can think a question through to right conclusions—capable of thinking; (c) A man of sound judgment. (d) A man who can express his views forceably and logically in conversation or on paper." His was an open and inquiring mind when it came to matters of theology. On his initial voyage he writes (February 13, 1865) "Last night we finished reading Seiss on the Last Times. I thought it a very interesting and solemn book—one that may do a great deal of good—in awakening the Church of Christ. I wish I knew the whole truth of the subject."

In 1877 the cholera, as well as the great famine, was raging. On March 20, his journal describes this "scene," as he calls it: "Gerraguntla Georavih and Jutike Gooravih and 4 or 5 others all had the cholera. Jutike Gooravih was much frightened. He groaned . . . and complained that the Liniment I put on him burnt him, spat out the medicine, etc., etc. In the other hut 2 rods away was Gerraguntla Georavih. He would shout between cramps and pain to Jutike Gooravih and say: 'Take the medicine. Don't groan that way. Trust in Jesus. Pray to Jesus. Don't be a coward, etc. etc.' Before he took each dose he offered a silent prayer and he got well. The other died!" If one stopped reading here, the impression might be received that the writer thought that one died because he did not pray and other got well because he did. The entry for the next day, however, clears the matter up. It says bluntly, "Jutike Gooravih died of fear and stubbornness."

Throughout his journals appear many evidences of his healthy common sense toward the issues of life. Friday, April 27, 1877, he makes this entry, "Mr. Worsap made me a present of an Adams Breech-loading Revolver, which I am glad to get." One Sunday (July 30, 1879), on his

way home from taking his family to London and starting them off for America, he writes, "Read 'Pickwick' this A.M. and 'Proverbs' this P.M."

In his method of missionary work Dr. Clough was a half century ahead of the conception of most of the Baptist constituency at home, upon whom he was dependent for his support. They thought that Christian experience and church organization should be after the manner to which they were accustomed in America. He felt that he must strike out on independent lines. Boldly he undertook to convert the Hindus, but his plans were upset when the pariahs came in large numbers. "After that," he says "my methods were made for me. All I did then was to follow and trust the Lord Jesus to help me and to show me what to do." This conviction did not put out of commission his enthusiasm, shrewdness, common sense, and unflagging zeal. Rather it enlisted them to the full.

When the opportunity came for him to go to Ongole, after having spent nearly a year and a half working with Dr. Jewett at Nellore, he grasped it willingly, believing that in that important strategic military and political centre he might work and not build on other men's foundation. Here he came into close fellowship with Yerraguntla Periah, a native who could not read, yet who had a deep religious experience. He had been a teacher of yoga and carried the guru staff, which was the symbol of his calling. Dr. Clough had great respect for his practical wisdom and says of him, "I loved that man. He never in all the years failed me. . . ." It was he who urged the missionary to "let this Christian movement go in the channels formed by Indian movements of spiritual significance."

Periah was a worker in leather. Soon Dr. Clough asked him to give up his occupation and devote all his time to preaching. This raised the problem as to how to get support for himself and his family. As long as he was known as a Hindu guru, he did not lack support as he went from place to place. On the basis of this experience they worked out a system of self-support. It was congenial to the minds of the Ongole preachers "to be given to eat, in a humble way, by those whom they had just taught." The number of preachers multiplied so rapidly that the missionary could say truly, "If that increasing staff of men had all asked monthly salaries, I would soon have been bankrupt."

From the beginning Dr. Clough used every possible means of discovering the attitudes of the people. By daily contact he learned from all, outcaste or high caste. He says: "I began to think with the people, and to live with the people their lives. I had to give up the practice of looking at everything with my American eyes. Even my American love

of freedom had to be suppressed lest I lose ground by my indignation over the fetters with which I here saw everybody bound."

The response of the outcastes to his preaching within three years of his arrival in India brought him to a crisis in his missionary work of which he writes, "I saw that it had come to this: "If I continued to receive the Madigas I would have to identify myself with them. Their sorrows would be laid upon me. . . . Despised on their account, rejected by the other castes, I would have to begin at the bottom round of the ladder in India, and see about climbing up, carrying the Madigas with me." Mrs. Clough also was involved in this difficult situation. She was in charge of the work of the school at Ongole. If her helpers and pupils were to be limited to outcastes, the standard of work she hoped to do would be lowered considerably. The matter had in a sense been settled by the baptism of seventy-six of these pariahs, but the Cloughs were still troubled in spirit. Then he writes, "We . . . were . . . jointly given an assurance that what he had done was right. We received what was to us a direct command from God to continue in our course." Briefly, what happened was this: Dr. Clough picked up a Bible from a pile of new ones recently received for distribution to English soldiers, and opened it at random. He was surprised to find before his eyes the words of Paul in I Cor. 1: 26-29—"For ye see your calling, brethren, how that not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble, are called. . . ." This seemed like a message from heaven. While he was meditating upon this, Mrs. Clough came in, picked up another of the Bibles and let it fall open in her hand. She began to read, then stopped and said, "It seems to be God's plan to save these outcastes first." Her Bible had opened at the very same verse. The missionary makes this characteristic comment concerning this coincidence, "It made no difference to us that these Bibles were all recently bound and that, perhaps, all would open to the same place."

While circumstances compelled Dr. Clough to devote a large part of his time to evangelistic work and to his efforts to improve the economic conditions of the outcaste people, he had an unflagging interest in enlarging their opportunities for higher education. He was largely responsible for the introduction of elementary schools, and for the establishing of a high school, a college, and a seminary. Eighteen years before the college became an actual fact, his diary (January 7, 1875) records that in a letter to Dr. Murdock, of the Foreign Mission Board, he said, "Missionaries must be Evangelists, but also Pastors, Doctors, Professors, Lawyers, etc., etc." Some two years later he notes in his journal (April 17, 1877), "Had a little warm discussion with Mr. Williams . . . [as to]

whether the school . . . was to be a college or an Anglo-vernacular school . . . [to train] preachers and teachers."

Force of circumstances compelled Dr. Clough to begin teaching the native preachers early in the history of the mission. He started a school in Ongole, to which most of the early preachers came, at least for a time. His instruction was of "an Eastern mold," so that the students were in no sense weaned away from their village environment. The students went on tours with the missionary, and "they remained simple, humble Madigas —but Christianized." It was only after several years of earnest effort, that a theological seminary was finally established (1871).

In his autobiography Dr. Clough recounts the practical principles he applied in his missionary work. He had learned to conform to the native code of politeness. He discouraged the growing tendency on the part of the younger generation to ape English ways. "So far as lay in my power," he says, "I held our Christian community close to Hindu customs and manners." After studying the native idea of humor, he used it to advantage, but learned early in his work not to make fun of the Hindu gods. He made friends of the Yetties who traveled over the country bearing burdens for the Sudras and Brahmans, and through them spread the news as to where and when he was going to preach. Realizing that it would be a hopeless task to try to uproot the native ideas concerning demons and evil spirits, he adapted himself to them, advising prayer to Jesus as the means by which the demons must come out.

Because it did not seem to fit the situation he was not strict in the matter of church discipline, nor did he hold rigidly to Western theology. He says: "In my preaching I did not dwell equally on the three persons of the Trinity. I found that people took up most gladly the story of our Lord Jesus. There was power in it." He taught his helpers to preach in the same manner. His defense of this method at an annual conference brought a charge of heterodoxy against him from the president of the seminary which he had labored so earnestly to establish.

The great famine of 1876-1877 brought care and opportunity to Dr. Clough beyond the capacity of an ordinary man. It turned his hair white, but did not daunt his indomitable soul. He toiled unceasingly to save the people from starvation. Long before the famine ended he realized that multitudes were turning to the religion whose followers had saved them from death. He knew that when the opportunity came the people would come into the church in throngs. He was determined to exercise the greatest care in admitting them and to avoid baptizing many at one time if possible. Baptisms had been discontinued in March, 1877, and all understood that no one could be received while the famine lasted. He abhorred what was implied in the term "rice Christians." Though under

great pressure because the people pressed upon him to baptize them, he hesitated to act until forced to do so by the turn of events. Word from America assured him that he would have the backing of the Baptists there. A Roman Catholic priest, with whom he was well acquainted, told him that if he was not willing to receive into his church those who were pleading for baptism, the Roman Church would grant their request. These considerations led him to immediate action. His diary for June 16, 1878, says: "We baptized 102 to-day; 74 of these were heads of families, all from Ongole." From this date the tide rose, reaching its crest on July 3, 1878, on which day 2,222 were baptized. Two years later, when it was decided to organize into churches the Christians at the various centres which had developed, the Ongole church, which had been organized January 1, 1867, with eight members, numbered 14,872.

Then came one of the most delightful experiences of the missionary's life. In 1881 Dr. Samuel Francis Smith and his wife, touring Asiatic missions, spent ten days at Ongole. One day they visited Prayer Meeting Hill and sang Dr. Smith's hymn, "The Morning Light Is Breaking." The next day the poet-preacher gave the morning sermon and baptized ninety-six converts. On leaving three days later he said, "Last Saturday and Sunday were the choicest days I ever lived." He rejoiced that the prophecy of his "Lone Star" poem had been fulfilled, and not long afterward wrote:

Then hail, "Lone Star!" Of all the wreath
  Thou art the fairest gem,
As once, o'er fair Judea's plains,
  The Star of Bethlehem.

Shine on! We learn to pray and wait,
  To toil and trust, through thee—
A star of triumph on Christ's brow,
  And faith's high victory.

In God's acre at Newton Centre, over against each other, rest the bodies of Samuel Francis Smith and John Everett Clough. One, the poet whose inspiration saved the "Lone Star" from being blotted from the Christian firmament; the other, the craftsman whose toil brightened that "Star" until it outshone its neighbors. Over the grave of this noble missionary, and more enduring than the granite shaft upon which it appears, is carved the verse which nerved his faith to its highest endeavor—"Be still and know that I am God."

Where Ignorance Is Bliss, 'Tis Folly

Of all the old-time tear-jerkers few have been more popular than James Nicholson's

> Whiter than snow, yes, whiter than snow;
> Now wash me, and I shall be whiter than snow.

It is said still to be popular in prisons and rescue missions, although it must remain a moot question whether its charm lies in its theology or in the decided lilt of William Fischer's sprightly tune. Evangelists and song leaders who have called it out through the years have probably thought that they had good scriptural authority for the sentiment. Is not this the word of the Lord, as transmitted by Isaiah? Yet despite the traditional rendering, "Come now, and let us reason together, saith the Lord: though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow; though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool," it is far from certain that this is what Isa. 1:18 really means. That the Hebrew may be so translated is not to be gainsaid; on the other hand, as commentators have frequently pointed out, the words may with equal fidelity be rendered either as an indignant question, "If your sins be like scarlet, can they become white as snow . . .?" or as bitter irony, "Come, let us urge our pleas against one another: though your sins be as scarlet, let them be white as snow . . .!" There can be little question but that the stinging question or the sarcastic jibe—and essentially these are one and the same: blood-red sins cannot be so easily washed out as a frivolous people easily and casually imagine—fits the context of scathing rebuke and denunciation far better than does the traditional rendering. Thus through the years there has been an increasing tendency on the part of commentators and translators from Wellhausen to Pfeiffer so to interpret.

Nor need it be feared that this denies the possibility of forgiveness. Repentance is a foundation stone not only in Christianity but in the Judaism that gave Christianity birth. So important was this note that it became a legendary commonplace that before the world was created, before the divine law was announced, in the mind of God together with the law itself was repentance. At the very centre of Jewish thinking stood the confidence: "Before the mountains were brought forth or even thou gavest birth to the earth and the world . . . thou turnest man to crushing, and sayest, Return, ye children of men." But it was a wholesome view of repentance, something far more than a momentary "feeling sorry." It involved restitution: filthy hands must be scrubbed, evil deeds must be

stopped, the fruits of repentance must be shown. So too in early Christianity. The rebellious son who said, "I won't," must go into the vineyard and get to work; the gift before the altar was not to be offered until the would-be worshiper had been reconciled to his brother; the repentant Zacchæus must restore fourfold.

With sound notions of moral obligation such as these the Jewish and early Christian view of the fatherly love of God, his readiness to welcome the genuinely repentant sinner, and his joy over the returning prodigals—in a word, the Fatherhood of God—was in small danger of abuse. Today with our increasing restiveness to control, human or divine, the Fatherhood of God would seem in many circles to have degenerated into a sickly and flabby Papahood of God, with all fear or thought of punishment, all thought of making good, banished as something distinctly mid-Victorian or worse. There are no such things as sins; at worst they are trifling and inconsequential errors, which, if we deign to glance at them at all, are to be dismissed with an airy, "Oh, well, he—high or low, as the case may be—ought to know I didn't mean it."

To this growing tendency the word of Isaiah, properly rendered, may well be applied: scarlet sins will be treated as scarlet and not as white; grimy hands are not white hands, and do not become so by a perfunctory rinsing. This is not to deny the possibility of forgiveness. Isaiah clearly recognized it: if the nation proved obedient (with all that obedience entailed), they could once more eat at a bountiful table.

There is another old gospel song: ". . . the bird with the broken pinion never soared as high again." And it is far truer to the facts of life than is Nicholson's rollicking ballad, though we may not sing it with quite the same gusto. As one very dear to me once said, "Haven't most of us broken wings?" Indeed we have; and many of us can still fly. That is the confidence that leads us to keep our chins up and to press on. But it were folly to forget the pain that followed for weeks the break or to deny that in the succeeding years there have been all too frequently a numbness and a dull ache. This is an honest world. There are no short cuts to happiness.

From Off the Campus and On

The Editor considers it a distinct achievement to have been able at last to pry an article from Professor Donovan. For months the pressure has been on; our readers will echo the editorial satisfaction. Few men in this generation have built themselves through the years into one institution as solidly as has this gifted teacher. After a few years of secondary school teaching, following his graduation from Colby College, he entered Newton Theological Institution. He never left. Immediately upon graduation, in 1898, he joined the faculty, and through the years continued in the department of Old Testament. He is now a professor *emeritus* of the school he did so much to further. It would be easy to list some of his achievements during the past four decades; it is utterly impossible properly to appraise his influence on the hundreds of students who learned lessons of fidelity and devotion to duty from a scholar whom they knew practiced what he preached. It is with more than ordinary pleasure that we welcome him to the pages of the Crozer Quarterly.

Mr. Weimar is a Philadelphian by birth and a graduate of the University of Pennsylvania. For over thirty years he has taught in the high schools of Philadelphia. In addition to a distinguished career as a teacher, he has found opportunity in fields far removed from the academic—and from one another—since he has been both an artist's model and a bricklayer. He is also a member of the Philadelphia Classical Club; in fact, it was at a session there that he read a paper which prompted the request for this essay.

Professor Comfort is best introduced in his own breezy words (which he had no idea would see the light of day): "I took an A.B. at Haverford College in 1924 and subsequently did graduate work in classics at the American Academy in Rome and at Princeton, where my doctoral thesis was in papyrology. Since 1932 I have been teaching principally Latin, Greek, and ancient history at Haverford. In justice to your constituency a distinction should be drawn between teaching history, which I do, and being an historian, which I am not. I can do better in Roman ceramics. The view presented in this article grew from observation in Europe during 1939 and 1940 while serving with the American Friends Service Committee, and the ancient analogy developed here was only an afterthought—though I think a sound one. At any rate, regardless of one's views on world amalgamation, more people ought to learn more from antiquity, and the fact that they don't lies principally on the doorstep of us classicists." The present essay was read before the Philadelphia Oriental Club this past year.

Professor Pritchard joined the Crozer faculty at the beginning of this academic year, in the department of Old Testament. He has made a deep impression as an exact scholar and able teacher. He received his doctor's degree last June from the University of Pennsylvania, where he had

majored in archæology and history in the department of oriental studies. His thesis, *Palestinian Figurines,* is in press and will be reviewed in these pages in the near future.

Mr. Keighton is far too well-known to readers of the Crozer Quarterly to require formal introduction. Rarely does an issue appear without a review from his pen. For nearly twenty years he has been minister of the Church of the Evangel, at Narberth. He holds two degrees from Crozer, was for some years instructor in English and public speaking at the Seminary, and was just recently elected a trustee.

Dr. Dubs is the son of a missionary to China and grew up in that country. After six years of missionary service sickness in his family forced his return to America. For the past six years he has been on the faculty of Duke University in the department of philosophy. He holds a doctorate from the University of Chicago.

Since 1922 Dr. Neisser has been associated with the Crozer extension department. In 1926, he became its director, in which position he has remained ever since. His connection with the Seminary, however, far antedates 1922. He graduated in 1902 and subsequently took graduate studies which led to the degree of Th.M. in 1915. From 1913 to 1920 he taught Greek. In addition to his many other duties he was for many years secretary of the faculty, and since 1937 has been librarian of the Seminary. For many years a Philadelphia pastor, president of the local school board, president of the Chester Rotary Club, prominent in all civic and religious enterprises, he has made his name known and his influence felt far beyond the confines of the Crozer campus.

Lack of space forbids more than the barest identification of the scholars "from off the campus" who have contributed reviews to this issue. Dr. Bronk was for many years on the editorial staff of the American Baptist Publication Society. Professor Brush is head of the department of history at Andover Newton. Dr. Dauerty, of Moorestown, N. J., will be remembered for his recent article, "The Puritan and the Anglican Spirit." Professor Della Vida, of the University of Pennsylvania, is a world-renowned Arabist. Professor Gezork holds the chair of social ethics at Andover Newton, while Dr. Herrick has been for many years its distinguished president. Walter Marshall Horton is too well-known in theological circles to require more than a hearty welcome. Sparks W. Melton, an alumnus and trustee of Crozer, has been since 1908 the pastor of the Freemason St. Baptist Church and Norfolk's most beloved citizen. Professor Moehlman, of Colgate-Rochester, is a frequent and welcome contributor to the Crozer Quarterly. Mr. Morey is the supervising principal of the Swarthmore (Pa.) school district. Dr. Rose, a graduate of Rochester and a trustee of Crozer, is minister of the First Baptist Church of Philadelphia. Professor Speck, of the University of Pennsylvania, one of America's most distinguished anthropologists, will be remembered for his recent article, "An Ethnologist Speaks for the Pagan Indians."

BOOK REVIEWS

On Being a Real Person, by Harry Emerson Fosdick, New York, Harper, 1943, pp. xiv, 295, $2.50.

It was Henry Drummond who used the phrase "spiritual diagnosis." He was a counselor to the troubled by virtue of his own religious genius long before counseling had come to this new emphasis.

Every pastor should seek to do his best; and there is a skill that can be acquired if one can have the patience to listen and to study. It cannot be denied, however, that this is in a measure a gift. It would be a great service to our Protestant faith if those who have the gift and have acquired the skill could be available like a spiritual clinic for the emotionally distressed. Since this is not possible, it is necessary for every minister to equip himself as best he can to be a counselor to the distressed. And if he is to help people to become "real persons," he must consider very seriously just what it means to be a real minister. A very busy pastor who was a helpful counselor once complained to a discerning friend because he had to give a great deal of his time to people who wanted to talk with him. "How would you feel," said his friend, "if nobody wanted to talk with you?" Dr. Fosdick out of his experience might write also "on being a real minister." Certainly there is something wrong if a minister is not a person whom the troubled seek. This is the first reason, therefore, why pastors should read the book.

The fact that it has moved so quickly to the top of the best sellers in nonfiction has not happened because Dr. Fosdick is a familiar name and has a vast following but because the book addresses itself to human need. When people are actually helped by a sermon and have a good chance at their word, they do not say in the common phrase, "I want to tell you how much I enjoyed your sermon"—which is a sort of meaningless familiarism of speech like "the guest speaker of the morning." They say, "You have given me something to live by." People have been more or less discouraged by the presentation of a religion that they "have had to live up to." What they are seeking consciously or unconsciously is a religion "to live by." This explains much of the great deflections which began with Christian Science and have multiplied to our confusion and humiliation with endless fads and isms.

It is quite likely that certain readers may be disappointed in the book. Those who are versed in the jargon-theories of modern psychology to the point of sophistication may say it is similar to a lot of "popular stuff" that has flooded the market of pseudo psychology. And the strongly evangelical may say it is a maximum of self and a minimum of God. If, however, one will read the introduction and the references, he will understand both the expressed purpose of the book and the wealth of reading and study that are behind it and inside of it.

Dr. Fosdick should be credited with sticking to his text, and one should be thankful that it is not a book of rambling psychology and pious observations but a book aimed to give answers to ordinary persons. Take for example the first chapter on integration. There is an understandable reason, he says, why in modern psychological parlance the word "integration" has taken the place of the word "salvation." It has not taken the place of it but it has given it new significance, just as the word "wholeness" did in an earlier and less psychological period. This is what he has done with other words which have crept into our vocabulary somewhat ahead of our understanding of them—rationalization (an overworked word), sublimation, complexes, defense mechanism, self-expression, etc.

A pastor may analyze his congregation and see how true it is that in a general way in the pews before him there are the three classes of which Dr. Fosdick writes—those who never get themselves together, those who do it on the low and egocentric level, and those who achieve it on the high spiritual plane. This is what John Oxenham said in the lines we love to quote:

"To every man there openeth
A way, and ways, and a Way."

An understanding of the fact and an effort to help people find the "high way" is our job.

A counselor can get real help by reading and reflecting on the chapter on conscience. It is realized that in the more neurotic instances where there is a psychiatric approach there must be some sort of transference from the patient, shall we say, since the soul is sick, to the counselor—a sort of parent-relation, for instance, or some other. Whatever it is it must not be a conscience transfer. That is the point at which many of us failed in the days when we struggled with all too little help. The counselor cannot be conscience for the person he seeks to help. That is what the counselor should learn about himself. And there is, as Dr. Fosdick brings out, the sense of guilt which plays so big a part in soul disorder and which may be a defense mechanism until it breaks down and a neurosis ensues.

The chapters of the book that are the best help for most of us are the last two: on released power and the psychological approach to faith. In these chapters he is the inescapable preacher, and there is a fine homiletic content. "Conversion," he says, "can now no longer be thought of as an ecclesiastic specialty but as a profound human necessity"—from which statement he moves on to St. Paul and the committed personality as a channel of power. If we can make that essential Christian truth real in these days, we will be real ministers of Christ. In the last chapter on faith, which he makes so vigorous by using John Buchan's phrase, "the invisible means of support," he says a new day has dawned for coöperation between the physician and the minister. This is a statement we may well ponder. It had a striking confirmation for us here at Andover Newton in our experience with Dr. Richard Cabot, who did his final teaching to theological students in the seminary. The pastor would be very wise if he would seek to find some physician with whom he could "team up" in friendship, faith, and understanding. It may not be possible, but failure to establish such a therapeutic partnership should not be the minister's fault. These two men united in spiritual understanding can help each other; and in helping each other they can help far more by the grace of God the sick of soul.

E. C. HERRICK

Origin Legend of the Navaho Flintway, by Berard Haile, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1943, pp. 319, $3.00.

To review this book with full justice to its matter and method would require the qualifications of a specialist in the now abundantly known field of southwestern ethnology. By a reviewer whose background, however, does not lie in this area of American culture the Chantway can only be evaluated as a treatise dealing with the partial content of a native realm of thought; as an exposition of a philosophy whose roots of religion lie deep in the strata of Indian experience with life forces real and imaginative. The student of religious phenomena in these spheres of preliterate civilization can hardly bring them as yet to a stage of generalized understanding. They are too little known outside the circles of anthropology. They still remain too unwieldy

in quantity and quality for a method of treatment, let alone handling, to have been devised for their comprehension by religionists. Their portent in the life history of mankind is, however, profound. Such studies as these are building blocks in a structure of concepts still far from having even its basement formed. Father Haile's book is big in dimensions of quality and conception. The reviewer knows what concentrated endurance is required to record in native text such an amount of dictated recitative—over 130 pages in double column. A formal review of the volume would be impossible. It is not that kind of a product. To summarize its contents would, moreover, be a belittling and perfunctory task. The meaning of the Navaho rituals runs like an anthem through the whole text. Judgment cannot be made on a bar or stanza broken out of its context. It is either worth while reading with a mind to understand its implicit theosophy in full or to let it alone. The lazy mind may better do the latter. We have so many of that classification that our cherished legacy of religious notions is just where it is—behind in the world of affairs. For a serious reader to lay down such a treatise without having come to feel something of the place it holds in the growth of human thought upon supernaturalism is to acknowledge a bias against man's universal mental ability. Scholars can no longer afford to do this as they have heretofore allowed themselves to do. They may rather accept these records of religious achievement and the author's exposition of etiological factors in its formation as reference readings for homiletics when convinced that theology must wake up to its responsibilities as the social and natural sciences have ordered it.

Father Haile's volume holds to the high standard of scholarship set by the Franciscan savants whose recent publications in the field of linguistics and ceremonialism have contributed so much to knowledge of Navaho culture. Should one stand in admiration of the talents of research and authorship or of the ethos of an unlettered people who build into their culture a mythological cycle with ceremonial symbolism which forms the subject matter of such treatises? The reader may make his choice as the reviewer has made his. It is difficult to regard the legend of the Flintway objectively. It is too deeply fraught with the kind of meaning that sounds the depths of human appeal for curing of disease, internal injuries, fractured bones, restoration of consciousness and lost vitality, and even restoration of life (p. 7).

As to what Flintway means, Father Haile explains the term as a compound name of rites and chantways with their specific symbols, such as Flintway, Featherway, Beadway, and the like. The word compound conforms with native terminology. The ceremonial has been in possession of the tribe for a very long time. There are sixty-seven songs and prayers in the origin legend presented in over two hundred pages of the text with translations. The body of the text is analytically discussed in paragraphs covering over forty pages of explanation of its elements. It is an idealogical cultigen. It is composed of elements that occur in other chantways each having "its supporting legend, its repertory of songs, prayers, ceremonies, its paraphernalia, its sand paintings, its prayersticks, and jewels for sacrificial offerings." One small rite, however, is essential, without which "no chantway ceremonial can be effective": the Blessingway rite. All Chantway ceremonials must add portions of Blessingway to secure their effectiveness. In a number of the nine-night ceremonials the fifth night is set aside for it. Five-night and less ceremonials need not set aside an entire night for Blessingway, but may make provision for it to be inserted here and there. The Flintway was formerly a nine-night and day festival but it has been shortened.

Turning to examine the Flintway legend, we find in one of its versions an imposing example of the power of its similes. "Life there is instrumental in restoring life."

> The hero is shattered by White Thunder beyond recognition. To demonstrate his power over life, the singer, Gila Monster, deliberately destroys himself and broadcasts his body parts. When reassembled, the living pouch is made to step across these body parts and thus impart life to them again. Living medicine people then furnish the pattern for the figure of the hero's body which is to be restored. The lines on this figure are followed in reassembling even the minutest particles of flesh, blood, bone and marrow of the man. The living medicines themselves sing, while the living pouch puts life into the reassembled body parts. Spiders spin the marrow and ligaments of the bones, the sun and moon carriers restore his eye sockets, nerves and sight, deer birds prepare a stretcher on which he is to be transported, the medicine people continue to sing at every angle of his surroundings. Thus everything breathes life in an effort to restore the lifestuff. Popularly therefore this chantway is called Lifeway. Flintway and Lifeway are synonymous (p. 8).

Can one wonder at the desire expressed ("naïvely perhaps," writes Father Haile) by Curly of Chinlee, who was one of his chanters, that a record of the Flintway legend be "placed in our libraries or *home for books*" (p. 9)? Or at the sympathetic conclusion of the author when he writes as the final sentence of his introduction, "On the whole, Navaho society still feels the necessity of Flintway"? How many of us not in the clergy would be willing to be religiously tolerant enough to add that society at large feels the necessity of psychotherapeutic performance—something akin to Flintway?

As knowledge of myth personalities in the hitherto unwritten literature of man grows more profound upon appearance of each new treatise like Father Haile's, their monumentality in the history of religion as a whole becomes more impressive. Clergy and laity, Europeans and native peoples, societies and castes should become the beneficiaries of systematic effort to record and understand "primitive" (*sic*) philosophy revealed in such sagas. The reviewer-to-be has accordingly been moved by a motive more worthy of Father Haile's theme than to do a formal review, namely, that of pointing out to the learner, in fields of research yet untouched by most students of religion, the responsibility of reading such treatises for himself. Every seminary library in the land should devote an alcove to treatises in the field of preliterate religious science and induce its future "social evangelists" to spend much time there in the course of theological training. The graduate curricula of the humanistic sciences operating in our secular universities have already begun to encroach upon the territory of the seminaries. Which phase of schooling is to take over the final program of training?

F. G. SPECK

Redemption and Revelation, by H. Wheeler Robinson, New York, Harper, 1942, pp. xlviii, 320, $3.00.

It is not often that one finds a theological book which adequately unites the point of view of the historical critic with that of the psychologist and that of the constructive theologian. This is that rarity. It is too bad that its threefold perspective is so rarely achieved, for each of the three points of view is misleading when it stands by itself. Historical criticism alone leaves us with the dead bones of ancient religious beliefs, psychology with the dubiously valid implications of private religious experiences, while constructive theology is apt to ride off on the Pegasus of some ephemeral philosophy. Dr. Wheeler Robinson, of Regent's Park College, Oxford, is a competent historical critic who also knows his way around in the psychological and philosophical fields. His historical competence shows most clearly in the chapter on "The Meaning of Redemption," where his grasp of the richness of biblical metaphor prevents his exploiting any one metaphor to the exclusion of others, as most theories of the atonement have unfortunately done. His psychological competence shows most clearly in the chapter on "The Psychical Media" of revelation, and in the concluding discussion on the psychology of the redeemed Christian. His philosophical competence shows

itself in his discussion of *historical actuality* as the great medium through which Christian revelation and redemption are given to us, and in the skill with which this central idea is made to dominate the whole book.

By the "actuality of history" Robinson means "the realistic achievement of eternal values in the unique category of time" (p. xi). Admitting with disarming candor that history, as a medium for the realization of eternal values, is shot through and through with contingency, relativity, error, and moral failure, he nevertheless sees in history a redemptive victory of divine justice and love over all these limitations and deviations. While many sorts of natural phenomena and psychic experiences may help to reveal God's redemptive presence, the medium through which God has best shown himself is that of *actual events, interpreted as divine redemptive acts by the prophetic consciousness, and recognized as such by those who have been redeemed.* (Cf. Archbishop Temple's "coincidence of event and appreciation.") While all history is full of revealing redemption, the history of Israel brings the whole process of redemption to sharp, unforgettable focus. In the unique events of the life of Christ, God shows us his eternal face, makes manifest his eternal victory: "His love is the love of God . . . no longer overthrown by the world, but triumphing over it" (p. 185). No external proofs can ever finally convince us of this; it is revealed only to the inner ear of the Christian by the Spirit. The redemption which God won "for" us, in the cross of Christ, is confirmed by the redemption accomplished "within" us by the spirit of Christ (p. 244). Human, all-too-human, is the life of redeemed Christians, as Robinson describes it, involving a "Kenosis of the Spirit" far deeper and more humiliating than that involved in the Incarnation; yet the reality of the divine presence in our weakness is the final confirmation of our faith that God and eternity are victorious in Christ, in Israel, and in history as a whole.

Uneven and often difficult in its style, heavy in its scholarship at time, the book rises at climactic points to great heights of eloquence and religious devotion. So, for example, at the conclusion of Part II, the memorable meditation on "Gibbet Hill." Altogether, this concluding volume of Robinson's trilogy—*The Christian Doctrine of Man, The Christian Experience of the Holy Spirit,* and now *Redemption and Revelation*—enables us to understand better than any of his previous works why this Baptist scholar holds such a leading place among Free Church theologians in England.

WALTER M. HORTON

Religion Faces the World Crisis, by Leroy Waterman, Ann Arbor, George Wahr, 1943, pp. x, 206, $2.25.

In 1938 this reviewer listened to a plea by President Waterman to the American Oriental Society for the application of the results of scholarly research in the oriental field to the ongoing of contemporary life. There, his thesis was: "We may be derelict in linguistic acumen, historical precision, or chronological accuracy, and no one living be the worse for it and few the wiser, but if we fail to clarify, wherever possible, the spiritual thought inheritance within our field as it applies to the most pressing problems of human life on this planet, we may well be responsible for irretrievable loss in which all men will unwittingly be forced to share" (*Journal of the American Oriental Society,* LVIII [1938], p. 412). Now, when events render an apology unnecessary, Professor Waterman has sought to bring a great mass of technical research to bear upon the present crisis. The author, a professor of Semitics in the University of Michigan, has distinguished himself as the editor of several volumes of cuneiform texts, reports of archæological work in Irak and in Palestine, and as the translator of a number of books in the Old Testament section of *An*

American Translation of the Bible. With this background of technical distinction he has now addressed himself to "a study of the religious aspects and motivations of civilization."

This study surveys a wide field. In the first three chapters the author deals with the beginnings of religion, the philosophy of science, the present ineffectiveness of organized religion. The next five chapters constitute a fresh analysis of the conflicting forces at work in the religion of Israel from the thirteenth century down to Christian times. The chapter, "Ethical Religion—Christianity's Buried Talent," is an appeal for the practice of the ethical religion of which Amos was the innovator. The author's obvious enthusiasm for Amos and Jonah has resulted in an excellent appraisal of the contribution of these two books. "The book of Jonah," he feels, "comes the nearest of any book in the Bible to presenting a completely ethical program of religion for mankind" (p. 115). Amos stands at the headwaters of ethical religion. His book deals purely with human problems and the prophet proposes a purely human salvation, "a solution that is just as valid without as with religion" (p. 58). Yet the salvation proposed by Amos has never received community approval, for "always something more, which has made it definitely something less, has prevailed" (p. 70).

This book sounds a very wholesome emphasis for the Christian church. The strongest part of the appeal is the evidence with which Professor Waterman is most at home, the prophets of Israel. There he has found a key which will unlock many doors—many doors which need badly to be opened. Whether any one key will unlock all doors is questionable. A scholar has done what he has preached—he has brought to bear on the present crisis in world history his own province of information in a form which an intelligent lay reader can understand. He has not merely asked the question, "What is wrong with the world?" He has put it against a rather broad background of men and of movements. While one may disagree with the author about many details, he cannot easily put aside the central thesis, that ethical religion remains as the one reasonable alternative to world chaos.

JAMES B. PRITCHARD

The Jews in Spain, by Abraham A. Neuman, Philadelphia, Jewish Publication Society, 1942, 2 vols., pp. xxxi, 286, and xi, 399, $5.00.

The history of the Jews in the Diaspora is a history of toil, suffering, and humiliation, but also of unflinching attachment to ancestral faith, of industrious work, of tireless study, and even, at times, of successful and glorious achievements. However, success and prosperity never were long-lived. A biological law, as it were, seems to prescribe a period of misery and persecution to follow each period of peace and welfare.

Nowhere in Europe did the pendulum swing as regularly as in Spain. The Jews, who settled there during the Roman age, after having enjoyed the benefits of general toleration under the emperors, went through one of the worst ordeals of their history under the barbarous and fanatic rule of the Visigoths. As soon as Spain was conquered by the Moors, the status of the Jews improved, and from the eighth to the eleventh century a brilliant Judæo-Arabic civilization developed, whose achievements in literature, philosophy, and science are unparalleled in the rest of Europe. The condition of the Jews gradually deteriorated with the advance of the Christian reconquest of Spain, until they were banished from the country, together with the Moors, in 1492. Spain, once the centre of Jewish scholarship and economic life, became one of the few countries in Europe where Jewish settlements are not found up to the present day.

Only a minor section of this long and fateful history forms the subject of the two thick volumes which Dr. Abraham A. Neuman, the president of Dropsie College, has published in the *Morris Loeb Series*. To be sure, the history of the Spanish Jews during the age of the Moslem domination is much richer in political and literary events and personalities than it is in the subsequent period. The spirit of toleration which allowed Yehudah ben Hallevi, Shemuel ibn Gebirol, Moses ibn Ezra and many others to develop their genius along the lines of Arabian science and art, but without becoming unfaithful to their Jewish tradition, came to an end, even before the intervention of the Christians, with the rise of the Almohades. However, the subsequent period is much better known in the minute details of everyday life. A huge mass of documents, which are entirely lacking for the Moslem age, throws a bright light upon the domestic and public conditions of the Spanish Jews during their subjection to the kings of Aragon and Castile. The archives of these two kingdoms (which merged into unitarian Spain at the end of the fifteenth century) have been fully preserved and contain thousands of acts dealing with the status of the Jews and their relationship to the crown. On the other hand, the *responsa* of the rabbis, *i.e.,* their answers to the religious and judicial queries submitted by their correligionists to their learning and experience, are no less numerous and provide us with a complete and faithful picture of the Jewish society, both in its internal organization and in the relations of its members to the king, the church, and their Christian neighbors. Availing himself of a tremendous amount of Latin, Catalan, Castilian, and Hebrew sources, and with a stupendous knowledge of contemporary research, Dr. Neuman has produced a work which is no less impressive for its scholarship than it is stimulating and interesting.

From Dr. Neuman's skillfully arranged and masterly presented book we receive a faithful and living picture of the life of the Jewish communities in Spain, manifold as it was. It was a hard and dangerous life, indeed, harassed by the extortions of the king, the persecution of the church, and the hostility of aristocracy and bourgeoisie. The physical survival of the Jews, and the prosperity which they enjoyed at times, were due solely to the rivalry between the different classes of the highly complicated mediæval society. The kings were ferocious in their taxation of the Jewish communities, but respected their autonomy, and even fostered their prosperity, since here was an ever-flowing source of income for the royal treasure; they shielded the Jews from the interference of the church, the nobles, and the commons because they wanted to affirm their royal authority against those forces which claimed independence from the crown. More than that, in their striving for absolute power and because of their need of technical help in financial matters the kings of Aragon and Castile employed prominent and clever Jews as advisers, treasurers, and administrators. It is really amazing to see those members of a despised and oppressed people enjoying an actual power which challenged any other. To be sure, nothing was more precarious than their position, and they were continuously liable to pay with their belongings, their freedom, and their lives for the changing mood or the weakness of their sovereign. The sudden disgrace of "the King's Jews" was by no means unusual; it reached its climax in the fateful year 1391, which marks the end of security and prosperity for the Spanish Jews. In the following century, in spite of a few short intermissions in persecution, their life was as miserable as possible, until their final expulsion.

Notwithstanding the continuous fear of a change for the worse, Jewish life during the period of relative toleration developed normally, following the pattern of the general civilization of the Diaspora. Some features, however, were new and original:

they were due to the peculiar conditions of the Spanish Jews, and chiefly to the survival of the manners and customs of the Moslem age. Dr. Neuman leads his readers through the entangled problems which were daily arising from the relations of the Jewish communities and individuals to state and church and which affected their economic, social, intellectual, and religious life. Even in the narrow environment of the *aljama* (the term for the noncompulsory ghetto of mediæval Spain) were to be found those contrasting interests and divergent tendencies, so typical of Judaism, where talmudic conservatism and progressive liberalism have always conflicted, especially when a long period of toleration encouraged assimilation to the gentile world.

As always happens when studying the millenary history of the Jewish Diaspora, the reader of this book, which deals with events and conditions of the thirteenth to the fifteenth century, gets the impression of being told contemporary history. The same problems, the same tendencies, and, alas, the same stupidity and ferocity which we meet in the past are still alive in our days. Dr. Neuman's stimulating book is something more than an excellent study in economic, social, and cultural life; it is also a precious contribution towards a broader and deeper understanding of contemporary problems.

G. LEVI DELLA VIDA

The Great Century in the Americas, Australasia and Africa, by Kenneth Scott Latourette, New York, Harper, 1943, pp. ix, 526, $4.00.

The fifth volume in *A History of the Expansion of Christianity* is the second of the trilogy devoted to the Great Century, 1800-1914. It traces rather sketchily the external growth of Christianity in Canada, the West Indies, Latin America, Australasia, and Africa south of the Sahara. About one-third of the volume is devoted to Africa, about one-eighth to Latin America, and about one-eleventh to Canada.

On Latin America the verdict reads, "it may be, in fact, that if all the facts were known the record would be one of net decline." Fortunately, the usual Protestant criticism is avoided, "clearly the lack of inner strength was not due to the fact that the Christianity was Roman Catholicism." Protestantism's failure in South America both quantitatively and especially qualitatively deserved much more extensive analysis and comment. For until Protestantism can capture the intellectuals it will not solve the South American Christian problem.

In Africa, Christianity "hastened the disintegration of the native African cultures" but constructively in definite antagonism to his exploiting white brother, opposing the introduction of liquor, the slave traffic, and occasionally the recruiting of labor for the great mining centres where only demoralization could ensue. But the higher qualities of Christian life among African converts "defy accurate measurement."

This comment upon the characteristics of Protestant and Roman Catholic converts deserves perpetuation: "In general, the Roman Catholic black was more docile, more dependent on the white man, and more submissive to him. The Protestant black was inclined to be more independent, to think for himself, and to be more self-reliant. The Roman Catholic regarded the Protestant attitude as breeding rampant individualism, vagaries, and rebellions. The Protestant adjudged the Roman Catholic methods to be producing automats, to be cramping the rightful development of human life, and to be making for a continuation of servitude, even though in a mild and benevolent form."

Admitting that Vol. V to the average reader "may well seem a jumbled mass of detail," have "the appearance of a *staccato* catalogue of names and events," the author contends that an underlying unity, nevertheless, exists, namely, the reciprocal effect between the white man's culture and that of the *primitive* peoples to whom the

Christian missionary went! In the third volume of his nineteenth-century trilogy, Dr. Latourette will describe the slighter impact and very retarded rate of progress of Christianity upon the civilized nations of Asia.

CONRAD HENRY MOEHLMAN

A History of Social Thought, by Paul Hanley Furfey, New York, Macmillan, 1942, pp. xiii, 468, $2.75.

This volume from the pen of the Catholic scholar is a rather ambitious undertaking. The history of social thought includes, according to Father Furfey's own definition, "the history of sociology, of economics, of political science and also the history of religions, of education, of philosophy, and even of literature and other disciplines, in so far as all these deal with group life" (p. 3). To do full justice to all these different aspects of the field in a single volume of four hundred pages is obviously impossible. Thus the reader has frequently the impression that the book is rather a catalogue. The author is himself fully aware of this fact which he considers to be unavoidable when the effort is made to write a history of social thought as broadly conceived as in this volume—a task which, he maintains, has never been done before.

Dr. Furfey traces in seventeen chapters his subject, beginning with primitive man and ending with the period between the world wars which he aptly calls "The Great Disillusionment." Included in this wide-sweeping survey is a chapter on the social thought of the Far East.

The author states in the preface that although he has written his book from the Catholic viewpoint he has tried to deal fairly with divergent opinions. On the whole, he has succeeded well in this effort. Many biblical scholars will probably raise a skeptical eyebrow when they read that Catholic scholars have defended successfully the Mosaic authorship of the whole Pentateuch (p. 61); Protestant readers will be surprised to find the statement that "Non-Catholic writers almost always . . . represent Christ as an attractive social leader like Mo Tzu" (p. 140). They will be inclined to disagree with the author's belief that "the social idealism of the Middle Ages reached heights which have not been attained since those days" (p. 179). They will probably feel that the treatment of the Protestant Reformation, tucked away on three pages in the chapter "The Rise of Bourgeois Naturalism," is rather unsatisfactory, and that the contributions of Luther and Calvin to social thought are not adequately dealt with. They will also be disappointed to find that neither the Anabaptists nor the Quakers, the English Christian socialists of the nineteenth century nor the social gospel movement in America are even mentioned.

However, one is only too well aware of similar shortcomings on the Protestant side, and therefore these criticisms are not intended to overshadow the profound scholarship and painstaking labor which breathe from every page of Dr. Furfey's book. The style is lucid, and the author has done well to avoid, wherever possible, the technical terminology which so frequently baffles the unprofessional reader. An excellent bibliographical essay and careful footnotes greatly enhance the usefulness of this valuable work.

HERBERT GEZORK

Intercultural Education in American Schools, by William E. Vickery and Stewart G. Cole, New York, Harper, 1943, pp. xviii, 214, $1.00.

As stated by Dr. Kilpatrick in the Foreword, this book is the first in a series presented "to help our schools deal constructively with the problems of intercultural

and interracial tensions among our people." The authors have here made a significant contribution, presenting a book which is sound pedagogically, with a program that is clear, complete, and helpful. They view the problem dispassionately and deal with it constructively. They refer to this volume as a manual of methods and have produced a comprehensive, helpful document of "Proposed Objectives and Methods," as the subtitle states.

The fundamental issue in intercultural education is: "Recognizing the diversity of racial, religious, ethnic and social-economic subcultures which are rooted in our social soil, and the need for integrating them in the interests of national unity, what are the principles of citizenship for American democracy to be, and how may we educate youth of different cultural backgrounds to fulfill the privileges and responsibilities of American citizens?" The approach to the problem is based on race and ethnic differences, inter-faith differences, and social and economic disparities, thus including within the scope of this work the entire breadth of the intercultural problem. The answer lies in a two-way approach, and the school program is built accordingly. The solution of the problem comprehends two basic themes: 1. to tolerate and encourage the best in the cultural backgrounds of the different peoples, and 2. to secure the amalgamation of these peoples in our American democracy through the program of the schools. It is the conviction of the authors that the race and culture conflicts which are serious threats to the well-being of individuals, communities, and the American nation as a whole can be lessened and in some instances eliminated by carefully planned educational programs. They make a plea for cultural democracy, mutual tolerance and respect and understanding. The whole approach is one of practical democracy based upon respect for the individual. Three goals of intercultural education are presented: first, to promote national unity by implementing proposals made in the monograph *The Purposes of Education in American Democracy;* second, to modify both minority and majority group culture traits which conflict with democratic principles; and third, to encourage the retention of diverse values, folkways, and institutions which are in accord with democratic practice, satisfy the personal and social needs of various groups, and enrich American life.

The educational program proposed is not alone a school program, but an integrated community program. It is suggested that the plan for a community be prepared by an overall committee consisting of school people and leaders in the community. After analysing the community conditions and pupil needs, the work should be directed by a competent, experienced adviser.

This book will be unusually helpful to curriculum committees and directors in planning work for teachers, although its scope is not extensive enough to serve as a manual for teachers. Especially helpful is the section on organizing classroom materials with examples of topics within units already included in many courses of instruction. A wise committee can follow the plan of introducing many more.

Its statements are well documented in copious reference notes, which, however, are at the end of the book instead of being footnotes, a plan which is rather unusual and involves some disturbance to easy reading. Also, placing the bibliography at the end of the book instead of at the end of the chapter seems a bit awkward, except that in this case the treatment is topical under four general topics and fifteen subtopics, supplying an extensive bibliography for curriculum committees which want to undertake serious and effective work.

FRANK R. MOREY

Marriage Laws in the Bible and Talmud, by Louis M. Epstein, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1942, pp. x, 362, $3.50.

This is a detailed discussion of marriage laws from the earliest biblical strata down to the laws regulating the practices of Jews of the present day. It makes the mass of Talmudic and rabbinic writing on this subject accessible to the non-Jewish scholar in a convenient form. By necessity non-English terms have been employed; for the benefit of the general reader these have been explained in a register. Jewish marriage laws have stood in the centre of Jewish culture as a cohesive nucleus about which Jewish life has revolved. The importance of marriage law is attested by the fact that almost any degree of heterodoxy was tolerated by Judaism except a fundamental deviation from the accepted laws of marriage. Such a deviation on the part of any group classified it as a sect and eventually eliminated it from Jewish life. The heavy dependence of marriage laws of western culture upon Jewish law makes the study of wide interest.

The book is composed of six monographs, or chapters, on the following subjects: polygamy, concubinage, levirate, intermarriage, incest, and other marriage prohibitions. The author's position on the first subject is that polygamy was an established institution in Hebrew society from time immemorial (p. 7), but that there was an inner-Jewish moral development toward monogamy which culminated in the prohibition of polygamy by R. Gershom (960-1040). Concubinage was an institution which the Hebrews took from Babylonia. Among the Hebrews there were degrees of wife-hood, concubine, captive wife, slave wife, slave girl—all of which were separate and distinct social positions. Concubinage broke down with the departure of the patriarchal organization and with the increasing emphasis upon a recognition of the individual (p. 61). The discussion of the institution of levirate (obligation or privilege of a man's brother to marry his childless widow) is an excellent commentary on the legal situation in the book of Ruth. The institution of *ḥalizah,* the release of a man from his duty as levir by the act of the widow pulling his shoe from off his right foot, is discussed in its historical development. Rabbi Epstein holds that the exclusive tendency or prohibitions against intermarriage grow out of the ancient policy of endogamy; there was no strong feeling against intermarriage until the Deuteronomic period in Israel. The author's discussion of the position of Reformed Judaism from the assembly at Braunschweig in 1844 until the present day with reference to intermarriage is interesting.

While endogamy was working as a force to keep marriage within the group, the laws against incest exercised their force in the opposite direction. The pre-Deuteronomic stage of incest laws would indicate a primitive matriarchy. During the successive stages of development, the Deuteronomic, the levitical, the rabbinic, there is a gradual enlargement of the circle of incestual relations, so that in the latest stage a man is prohibited from marrying his great-grandmother. Reformed Judaism, however, respects the levitical laws as well as those of the modern state with regard to incest.

While one can but have the greatest respect for the author's grasp of the difficult literature of the Talmud and the rabbinic writings, he must notice the absence of even a passing reference to some of the more recent literature on the *zonah* and the *qedeshah* as possible fertility-cult functionaries. The *Harvard Semitic Series* has added another admirable volume to its already impressive list of contributions to Semitic scholarship.

This scholarly volume does not propose to compete with the scores of books appearing on the theme "How to be Happily Married." Yet the minister or the religious counselor might find some help in this mass of material, the experience of

a group of people with the vexing problem of marriage over a period of over 3,000 years. The lessons which have been learned, the adjustments which have been made in Jewish custom and law are a valuable resource for one who would go beyond the surface of "happily married" pamphlets.

JAMES B. PRITCHARD

The Church in Disrepute, by Bernard Iddings Bell, New York, Harper, 1943, pp. 152, $1.50.

A harsh indictment: "The church has become little more than a private chaplain of the worldly," making excuses for and flattering its patron; it has had little influence of late and it seems unlikely to have much more in the near future.

Such is the indictment by the dean of an Episcopal cathedral in America, who was for a time president of a church college, and who has been a preacher at Westminster Abbey and St. Paul's Cathedral in London, in Oxford and Cambridge, at Harvard, Yale, Princeton, and many other universities and great American pulpits. Yet he dares to say that the church is in disrepute, and many will believe he makes his case.

One may not agree with some of the author's theological statements, but one is compelled to listen to this eminent churchman's arraignment of conventional Christianity. He affirms that the church should be standing against the practical atheism of the day and man's conceit that he is sufficient in his own divinity and can make his own heaven; that the world would not have fallen into such errors "if the church's message had remained Christian." It has forgotten how to "renounce and denounce" the sins of the day. It has preferred popularity to prophecy. Millions of Christians give lip service to the ethical convictions expressed by Jesus, for the proclamation of which he was rejected and crucified, but do not recognize that discipleship to him involves obedience to hard and searching sayings.

The author makes a strong case against divorce, but it may be questioned whether his differentiation between state and Christian marriages is fully justified. He believes that state schools in general are godless, and that government support should be given to schools of all religious bodies. Advocates of complete separation of church and state will sharply disagree with him.

The author finds much of the leadership in the churches today weak and undisciplined, and he lays responsibility for it largely, perhaps properly, at the doors of theological seminaries. While the author believes that conventionalized churches have little future if they pander to magic and to superstition, he thinks the winds will begin to blow again. He points to deliverances by the Pope, the Archbishop of Canterbury and others as indications that the church will rise again, although as a whole it is still held "in bondage to a dying social order." However, persecution will be almost certain for a church that will resist and not compromise. Although a tree may fall before the storm, there may be soundness in its roots from which a new growth will appear. There is always hope in a remnant which recognizes that God is all that really counts.

A dynamic deliverance which should be widely read and pondered.

JAMES H. FRANKLIN

What Is the Church Doing? by Henry P. Van Dusen, New York, Scribner, 1943, pp. xii, 194, $1.00.

This glowing and exceedingly readable account might well be termed "a report to the churches." In swift, sure strokes, pictures are painted for us of what is happening

to the churches in captivity (those in Norway, Denmark, Belgium, France, the Balkan lands, Germany, the Netherlands), to the youngest Christian churches (those in China, Japan, Madagascar, Sumatra, Africa), and to the *world church* as this has finally come into being through a gathering tide of Christian coöperation embodied in the World Council of Churches. The pictures are not always pleasant to look upon, but, considered as a group, they present an encouraging report to the church, holding an earnest that "in due season we shall reap if we faint not."

Undoubtedly the most dramatic of the pictures are those relating to the churches in captivity. The record of these churches under subjugation in Axis and Axis-occupied countries is a continuation of the Acts of the Apostles. After citing many specific cases of wisdom and heroism comparable to that of Bishop Eyvind Berggrav of Norway, and stressing that even in a time of war and defeat the church can win new life as it has in French Protestantism, Dr. Van Dusen goes on to disclose five shining facets in the spirit of the Christian churches under subjugation: namely, fortitude, sagacity, magnanimity, catholicity, and faith. The record is a heartening one, though shot through with the cruel shafts of suffering and injustice, and it holds strong promise for a better day yet to be.

Concerning the youngest Christian churches which have come into being in the last two centuries through the consecrated work of countless missionaries, two impressions stand out with especial vividness: "the profound, hitherto undiscerned unity of Christ's Churches, Protestant, in a single awareness of common responsibility for his Mission entrusted to them," and "the unexpected strength of the Younger Christian Churches, and even of those still more immature groups of Christians who had not yet taken formal place among the Churches of Christ." The way these younger churches have taken over responsibilities formerly handled only by missionaries from the western world is a source of encouragement, revealing both the underlying unity of the church and the possibility of Christ's newest and least mature churches reaching maturity under the pressing circumstances of crisis.

The World Council of Churches was projected into history on the eve of the present fierce conflict among men. Between the drafting of the constitution of this organization at Utrecht in May, 1938, and the outbreak of hostilities sixteen months later, forty-eight churches had accepted membership in this world-wide, Christian organization. Today seventy-eight churches belong, located in twenty-eight nations and on every continent. This impulse towards common effort may be but a step in the effecting of church union, welding the Protestant groups and those of the Eastern Orthodox Church into a fellowship of worship and work. At the present time, as Dr. Van Dusen points out, a most important development, which is being watched by Christians all over the world, is the proposal for church union in South India. There bodies representing all three of the major Protestant families—Anglicans and Methodists, Presbyterians and Reformed, and Congregationalists—have made approaches toward full, organic union. The final outcome of these proposals is expected to be decided by the spring of 1944. If union can take place there and be effective, then it means there are no unsuperable obstacles to the union of Protestant bodies everywhere.

This report to the churches will reward careful study by all laymen and ministers.

GEORGE W. DAVIS

BOOK NOTICES

Living Upstairs, by Francis Meehan, New York, Dutton, 1942, pp. 256, $2.50.

This is a book worthy of serious recommendation for what ails us. To those many who find themselves exhausted with the pressures of routine necessity or exasperated by the truculence of a world in turmoil, *Living Upstairs* comes as a revitalizing tonic. It is a real tonic in this that it is not satisfied with making us painfully conscious of our need of something we have not, but page after page and chapter after chapter proceeds with the delightful discipline of making us happy in the assurance that we have at hand an abundance of cultural riches whose grace we may share at will. And this saving grace is serious resort to the finer literature of the centuries. "Good reading," says the author, "brings a calm of mind, relief from cheap and temporary distractions, and a soul bathed in restfulness and permanence." Nor is this another poorly camouflaged invitation to ivory tower escapism. In one of his most suggestive chapters bearing the caption "With Curtains Drawn" he says: "If here we sit with curtains drawn it is not because we cannot bear the light; it is because, as Francis Quarles discovered, the best way to see the splendor of the centuries is to blow out the candle of the idle day." This attractive volume, with its insistence upon the profitable and pleasurable recourse to upper room cultural renewal as over against the exigencies of the practical and demands of living room, kitchen, telephone, and doorbell on the first floor level, has been upon the table of the reviewer for several months, but it has been lifted for a fresh indulgence in its superior charm again and again, and if for nothing else than its defiance of present trends toward the eclipse of cultural values, it stands high in the field of our proper appreciation.

IVAN MURRAY ROSE

A Vindication of Caspar Schwenkfeld von Ossig, translated (from the German of Christopher Schultz, 1769) and edited by Elmer Schultz Gerhard, Norristown (Pa.), Schwenkfelder Church, 1942, pp. 347, $1.50.

Caspar Schwenkfeld (1490-1561) was a devout and learned Silesian nobleman whose religious beliefs gave rise to a sect of the German Reformation. From Pennsylvania, where the sect at length took root, comes this translation of a work which is very important for an understanding of the man and his followers. It is a kind of omnibus of the Schwenkfelder way during its first century and a half. The group and its founder stood in sore need of vindication as far as this world's favor and understanding were concerned. Luther's rough abuse of Schwenkfeld only confirms our knowledge of the coarser side of the great Saxon reformer. The Lutheran reformers, as Melancthon and Illyricus, argued angrily with Schwenkfeld and doubtless considered they had him vanquished. The Jesuit mission of the Counter Reformation bore down hard on his flock. The renowned Frederick the Great invited them at length to return from their Pennsylvania haven to their native Silesia: this "Vindication" volume is dedicated to him. Schwenkfeld's doctrine is elucidated at some length, both in his own words and in the words of his followers. We must not call him an Anabaptist: "Spiritual Reformer," according to Rufus Jones' designation, is better. He had a keen sense of the distinction between the external Word of God in the Scriptures and the inner Eternal Word of the spirit. His Christology has an odd flavor. His view of the church again made a sharp distinction between visible and invisible. As regards the visible church, we may call him a seeker: compare him with Roger Williams. The apostolic church had vanished in the early centuries, even though the true members of Christ's church invisible had never failed. Into other

views of this interesting man we cannot enter here. The volume is marred by many typographical errors. It is not an easy book either to peruse or review. But it will be useful for consultation by students of the German Reformation and of the Pennsylvania German groups.

JOHN WOOLMAN BRUSH

The Root and Flower of Prayer, by Roger Hazelton, New York, Macmillan, 1943, pp. xii, 137, $1.75.

The best beginning is the one the author himself makes. An Australian clergyman, says Willard Sperry, visited many churches, Sunday after Sunday, in his trip across the United States. When asked what most impressed him about American worship services, he replied, "The badness of your prayers." We do not have to come from Australia to agree with that. Any intelligent, worshiping layman probably makes the same observation for himself, at least circumspectly and secretly. Even the minister who is eager to dissent from that judgment had better first ask himself why he always asks his visiting brother-minister to "Lead us in prayer" rather than, for example, "Read the Scriptures." Although the book, after a chapter on "The Badness of Our Prayers," devotes three chapters to presenting the nature, character, purpose, and philosophy of prayer, its "flower" is in "Prayer As Poetry: (a) Words, Images, and Rhythms and (b) Themes, Moods, and Movements." The closing chapters offer the title chapter, "A Bookshelf of Prayers" and "A Cycle of Illustrative Prayers," in which the author gives examples of nineteen prayers for the church year and occasional services. Let the reader give special attention to those chapters on prayer as poetry—they are the heart of the whole matter! Prayer is the centre of public worship, the high spot of the worship service, says the author. "Public prayer is like marriage. It is not to be entered into unadvisedly or lightly, but reverently, discreetly, advisedly, soberly and in the fear of God" (p. 105). Read this book and see at once the difference between genuine, religious prayers and the utterances of barren moralizations, sentimental nonsense, and "vain repetitions." It is a definitive answer to the modern disciples' "Teach us to pray." There will be objection from those who believe that the prayer of the minister should be spontaneous and the one praying should be concerned only with his own worshipful experience. That is an indefensible position. The one who prays in that way is neither worshiping nor leading others in prayer. The only ministers who could not profit by this book are those whose congregations would not benefit by the change in their prayers—for either one of two reasons.

ROBERT E. KEIGHTON

Prayers for Private Devotions in War-Time, edited and in part written by Willard L. Sperry, New York, Harper, 1943, pp. 64, $1.00.

This is a brief, practical, and excellent anthology of prayers of all ages. Of the 197 prayers, roughly one-fifth are ancient, one-half from the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Dean Sperry contributes thirty-four. The title reads: "For Private Devotions in War-Time"; but most of the prayers are fitting for common worship, and we believe their value and use will not end with the war. The selection is so good that despite the preponderance of modern prayers, the standard remains high. The peculiar perils of modern prayers are subjectivism, verbosity, and contemporary jargon. Martineau and Hunter are addicted to the first two. In the high calling of common worship such expressions as "our callings and recallings, and our manifold recallings," "chill the zeal," "tend toward," "folded hours" call attention to themselves and make us "turn aside from what has befallen us." Even Dr. Sperry is guilty of "special skills," "newest skills," "baggage," "environ," and "companion" used as a verb. Prayer must, indeed, be "disciplined and direct"—and free from archaisms and

the *nouveau*—as most of those written by the dean are. Generally they are in the *metier*. His own prayer for the "Communion of Saints" is superb. In addition to prayers for constant needs, the book is rich in special intercessions for country, for men in the services, for our allies, for our enemies, for war sufferers, doctors, nurses, home, and for world peace. The Postscript on the *collect* form and the Introduction to the Sources are packed with information. Incidentally, a careful re-reading fails to find Newman's prayer in the Sarum missal. It is fortunate that each chaplain going through the Army Chaplain School at Harvard receives a copy of the book. It is a real benefaction of the editor that all royalties are devoted to the relief of suffering churches of Europe. Again, Dean Sperry has placed us all in his debt.

JAMES SHACKELFORD DAUERTY

The Shepherdess, by Arthur Wentworth Hewitt, Chicago, Willett, Clark, 1943, pp. xiii, 200, $1.75.

From all reports this is the first book of counsel for the minister's wife. Even if there were others, it is difficult to believe that they would be serious competitors. (Perhaps that is exactly what they would be, "serious"—and hence, no competitors at all.) Dr. Hewitt is evidently a man of liberal mind and generous character, who has developed by experience an equilibrium of seriousness and humor that is the true sanity. The "Shepherdess," which is his name for the "mistress of the manse," is most skilfully and understandingly guided through the maze of bewildering situations that is the life of a minister's wife and, with rare perception of the essentials, is shown the basic principles of conduct and character to be observed in the church, the parsonage, societies, and organizations. Whatever she may find it necessary to do, Dr. Hewitt has a word for it. His "word" is uncommonly normal, natural, and down-to-earth, fortified by numerous examples and illustrations from both the Jews and the Samaritans. While the book sheds a direct light upon the "Shepherdess," let the Shepherd himself beware! Educators and engineers agree that the best form of illumination for reading is indirect lighting.

ROBERT E. KEIGHTON

In Quest of Foster Parents, by Dorothy Hutchinson, New York, Columbia University Press, 1943, pp. 145, $1.75.

This volume is published for the New York School of Social Work, of whose faculty the author is a member. While designed especially for those engaged in the placement of children, and, in a sense, for prospective foster parents, it is of interest to readers generally, because of the always present problem of home finding, now greatly accentuated by the enlistment of mothers in war industries and by the need of providing homes for juvenile *évacués.* By disposition, training, and experience the writer has unusual qualifications for her task. The material is presented in a clear, convincing, and common-sense way. The case reports are intensely interesting and revealing. The reader is brought to a sympathetic understanding of the trying situation in which the prospective foster parent, the homeless child, and the hopeful social worker find themselves, and comes to agree with the author's conclusion that "child placing is more than following an impulse, more than an amateur's prerogative, and more than sentiment or a patriotic duty." An excellent bibliography adds to the usefulness of the volume.

RITTENHOUSE NEISSER

The Healing of the Waters, by Amos N. Wilder, New York, Harper, 1943, pp. ix, 89, $1.75.

Amos Wilder is known to many, and rightly, as an able student of the New Testament. It is safe to say that he is fully as widely known as a poet who bids fair to occupy a distinguished place when the definitive volume of American literature is

written. Breadth of experience, depth of insight, directness of speech—these combine to make him a poet to be read and reread. It is a rare gift to be able to speak or write in such a way that those who hear or read it say, "Exactly, why couldn't I have said it?" And the beauty of it is, as you read, you know that the poet is not striving for effects: he is writing because he cannot help it. Most ministers—at least it is true of those whose so-called "libraries" I have seen—do not have an overstock of volumes of this quality. *The Healing of the Waters* might well sweeten many a shallow and acrid homiletic well.

MORTON S. ENSLIN

Humiliation with Honor, by Vera Brittain, New York, Fellowship Publications, 1943, pp. 108, $1.00.

When this book arrived for review yesterday, I had not the slightest intention of reading it. I opened it to see if it might possibly warrant a notice by someone who could be cajoled into writing a few words on "another slight book on pacifism." My eye caught several words in the brief *foreword* written by a prominent New York preacher. I smiled at the phrases ". . . makes it impossible to forget it . . . haunts memory and conscience . . . I do not see how anyone can read this book without being moved to deeper levels of thought and determination." How easy it is so to write! I am not smiling now. Casually I read the first page; I did not lay the volume down until it was finished. And now that it is finished I have no desire to describe it, save to say that I heartily agree with the writer of the *foreword*: "I, for one, lay the book down feeling sure that such people as Vera Brittain are needed in this world." Indeed they are! It is a series of letters written by this mother—an English nurse in France during the first world war—to her fifteen-year-old son in America, who is far from sharing his mother's views. In more senses than one these letters are "disarming." Fairness, sweetness, honesty are writ large on every page; and there is that haunting suspicion that in much that she says she is dreadfully right. I am far from sharing all her views; yet if she is in life—and I see no reason to question it—what she is in the printed page, I should like to know her personally. Perhaps this will be regarded as a "dangerous" book. Of course it is: it makes one think. Probably some will style it subtle propaganda: Satan masquerading as a gentle, gracious, and understanding mother, scrupulously avoiding what makes most pacifist tracts so obnoxious. I for one, do not feel inclined to try to classify it: I have read it, and it has moved me strangely.

MORTON S. ENSLIN

Which Way Ahead? by Walter Russell Bowie, New York, Harper, 1943, pp. xi, 145, $1.50.

A special distinction is given to *Which Way Ahead?* by the fact that it was selected by the Presiding Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church to be endorsed by him for use in the Lenten season of 1943. That fact, in relation to the contents of the book, reveals that neither the author nor the Presiding Bishop is at all complacent regarding the condition of the church today. Rather does it indicate that both of them feel that it is high time that the churches awake out of sleep if they are not to be swept aside by "the irresistible energies of life" that "may break out against it in some form of revolution." "Great clocks of destiny are striking now." The bells may toll for the church if it fails to listen.

A central thought of the book is expressed in a comparison between the attitude of the church and the Chinese resistance of all change for more than two thousand years under the influence of Confucianism. "There is a sort of Confucianism in the Christian Church." "It looks askance at anything that happens to be new." "They want everything about the church to keep to a comfortable pattern."

The necessary revolution may come from within, as in the days of John Wesley in

England; or it may come from without, as in Russia in the twentieth century. At present the church shows little understanding of the "horrible morass" in which common men wade. Hence, the churches often are empty while multitudes turn in other directions to find the satisfaction the common man needs.

The "ascending orders," which the author recommends to those who would respond to the call "Follow Christ once more," may seem too formal and ritualistic for many dissenters, but they are based on a conviction that the inner life of the churches must be renewed if they are to meet the needs of the hour. A concluding note of the book is a conviction that after the war we shall either be confirmed in old faiths that are really pagan in their selfishness or we may help the world believe that "only on the basis of Christ's truth can human life and human society stand secure."

JAMES H. FRANKLIN

The Art of Preaching, by Arthur Allen, New York, Philosophical Library, 1943, pp. 93, $1.75.

One who has been in the ministry many years and has come face to face with its problems has a feeling of regret that this book was not written a generation ago. The book exalts the art of preaching. This art is acquired by practice, not theory. It is a sacred trust, a blessed opportunity, and a divine call. It is the outstanding part of a minister's duty. It is his main function, his highest privilege, and his greatest responsibility. The preparation of the preacher is important. Health is a great asset. The human voice is the most wonderful, the most powerful, the most persuasive, and the most musical instrument known to man. Delivery involves diligent study if the sermon is to be acceptable, attractive, and impressive. In dealing with the problems involved in "What Not to Preach and What to Preach" questions sure to arise, such as the selection of text and the kind of sermon, are adequately answered. For example, the sermon should be short, simple, and concise. The preacher should learn the art of "leaving out." The book concludes with the conception of the ideal preacher, who must have a passion for souls as well as a passion for truth, and must be alive to the fact that the human soul is infinitely precious in the sight of God and that man was created for eternal fellowship with him. This is a book which should be in the hands of every young man who is looking forward to the ministry as his life's work.

SPARKS W. MELTON

Mind: Perception and Thought in Their Constructive Aspects, by Paul Schilder, New York, Columbia University Press, 1942, pp. xii, 432, $5.00.

Launching out into the area of mind with an acknowledgment of his indebtedness to Freud, Dr. Schilder seeks to determine how perception is conditioned by such elements as color, motion, sight, touch, hearing, and taste. Looked at from the viewpoint of the constructive energies of the psyche, action, trial, and error all play prominent parts in the formation of our pictures of other selves and of all objects in the world of sense. So "the object which is one's own body and the objects which are the bodies of others are the result of a psychic sensory motor construction and an expression of the constructive energies of the psyche" (p. 242). In similar manner, while there are real objects in the world, they are in part the result of a creative psychic construction on our part. Both the body image and the object are built up by continuous interchange with other human beings. Socialization thus plays a part in perception and is to be regarded as a fundamental form of human experience. Turning to the higher mental functions, among which are language, memory, thinking, and consciousness, Dr. Schilder points out that these all grow out of the interactions of the individual with his environment. To call attention only to the latter, our author writes: "Consciousness is not an independent phenomenon but consists of

the process of trial and error in perception and thought until the object and the outside world are reached. The individual has to compare again and again, and must not only know that he perceives but must also be aware of his effort in the construction of perception. The conclusion is, therefore, justified that consciousness is in itself self-consciousness. It is the attempt to bring experiences into a context" (p. 390). The general point of view is that the higher mental functions, like the lower, are the result of the psyche and the world in interaction. It should be noted that this volume, highly technical in character, is suited for the mature psychiatrist rather than the novice in mental investigation. The whole is increased in value by the extensive bibliography contained at the end of the volume. GEORGE W. DAVIS

Michigan Manuscript 18 of the Gospels, by William Merritt Read, Seattle, University of Washington Press, 1942, pp. ix, 75, one plate.

Here is another tool for which the textual critic will be grateful. It is a collation and analysis of a twelfth-century gospel manuscript (Mich. ms. 18; Greg. 538; von Soden ε 335). The manuscript has a K type text, although von Soden's classification of it as K^x is perhaps overhasty. Dr. Read appears justified in his view that for Mark and Luke it is closer to K^1. His analysis further reveals that the text, as might be expected, is decidedly mixed: it has some sort of relation to the Old Latin, may at some time in the history of the text have come under the influence of some of the fam. 13 group, and has some readings which are definitely Cæsarean. Other textual critics will read with awe Dr. Read's modest remark that to aid in the composition of a volume containing so much Greek type he learned the typecaster's trade and set the type himself. University authorities may well ponder the wisdom of making this procedure compulsory for all newborn doctors of philosophy who wish their theses published. MORTON S. ENSLIN

If They Don't Come Back, by H. Adye Prichard, New York, Macmillan, 1943, pp. vii, 77, $1.25.

The author is an Episcopal clergyman, in a New York City suburb. Its background is a letter or message to a friend whose young daughter died in war service in Libya. The friend is a believing Christian, who nevertheless finds it hard to face the problem of his loss, of his daughter's death. The title is, obviously, appealing—almost cruelly so—for all over the world today men and women, like this father, are agonizing in regard to loved ones, "If they don't come back?" One shouldn't begrudge these anxious or bereaved persons any—even platitudinous and far-fetched—consolation that may be offered them. Our own reaction, after reading this attempt to reassure and comfort, is a sense of futility and inconclusiveness: when all is said, has much been said? Must not the bereaved fall back upon bare faith, Jesus' "I am the resurrection and the life. Believest thou this?" The essay is, however, just what the subtitle claims, "Some Thoughts on Immortality." It restates most of the reflections on death and the life hereafter that men have been propounding through the ages, together with what is regarded as new light on the subject from psychic research, telepathy, and recent science. There is little sentimentalizing, and the tone is never "pious"; indeed, some will criticize the essay as lacking warmth and feeling. MITCHELL BRONK

We Believe, by John J. Moment, New York, Macmillan, 1942, pp. v, 134, $1.25.

A homiletical discussion of the *Apostles' Creed,* the *Nicene Creed,* and the *Athanasian Creed* with some historically valuable reflections such as the definite denial that Isaiah 7:14 refers to Jesus and that the "descent into hell" is biblical. One wishes that laymen reading this little volume might have found in it more of the most recent results of the historical study especially of the *Apostles' Creed* as found, shall we say, in *Protestantism's Challenge.* CONRAD HENRY MOEHLMAN

BOOKS RECEIVED

**It's Your Souls We Want,* by Stewart W. Herman, Jr., New York, Harper, 1943, pp. xv, 315, $2.50.

**Signs of Promise,* by Frank S. Hickman, Nashville, Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1943, pp. 186, $1.50.

**The Historic Church and Modern Pacificism,* by Umphrey Lee, Nashville, Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1943, pp. 249, $2.00.

**George Keith, 1638-1716,* by Ethyn Williams Kirby, New York, Appleton-Century, 1943, pp. vi, 177, $3.00.

The Peril of Bread, by J. B. Lawrence, Nashville, Broadman, 1943, pp. 188, $1.25

Twelve sermons by the executive secretary of the Home Mission Board of the Southern Baptist Convention.

Sermons in Outline, by Jerome O. Williams, Nashville, Broadman, 1943, pp. 210, $1.00.

Ninety-five sermon outlines (alphabetically arranged) by the business manager of the Sunday School Board of the Southern Baptist Convention.

Seeing the Multitudes, by Frederick Keller Stamm, New York, Harper, 1943, pp. 129, $1.50.

Ten addresses on the Beatitudes, which provide "a ringing challenge from the pen of one of America's best known pastors and radio preachers."

The Days of His Flesh, by David Smith, New York, Harper, 1943 [8th ed., revised], pp. lxiii, 549, $1.95.

The statement on the jacket, "A New American edition," and the word on the title page, "Eighth Edition, Revised," may prove misleading. The "eighth edition, revised" appeared in 1910. This is an unaltered reprinting.

**Heritage and Destiny,* by John A. Mackay, New York, Macmillan, 1943, pp. x, 109, $1.50.

**How Do We Know God,* by Richard Kroner, New York, Harper, 1943, pp. x, 134, $1.75.

**What Is Mature Morality?* by Harold Titus, New York, Macmillan, 1943, pp. 229, $2.00.

**The Philosophy of the Christian World Mission,* by Edmund B. Soper, Nashville, Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1943, pp. 314, $2.50.

**Christ and Christian Education,* by William Clayton Bower, Nashville, Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1943, pp. 128, $1.00.

**Science, Philosophy and Religion: Third Symposium,* published by the Conference on Science, Philosophy and Religion, New York, 1943, pp. xix, 438, $3.00.

**That They May Have Life,* by Stephen B. L. Penrose, Jr., Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1942, pp. xviii, 347, $3.75.

**The Tragedy of European Labor: 1918-1939,* by Adolph Sturmthal, New York, Columbia University Press, 1943, pp. xii, 389, $3.75.

**Christian Bases of World Order,* by Henry A. Wallace and others, Nashville, Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1943, pp. 255, $2.00.

**Popular Freethought in America: 1825-1850,* by Albert Post, New York, Columbia University Press, 1943, pp. 258, $3.00.

The March of God in the Age-Long Struggle, by John J. Wicker, Nashville, Broadman, 1943, pp. 234, $2.25.

The author has attempted a rapid "running discussion . . . of the whole Bible" for the purpose of encouraging people to reread that much neglected book.

**Christianity and Civilisation,* by H. G. Wood, New York, Macmillan, 1943, pp. 128, $1.25.

Guide to Quaker Practice, by Howard H. Brinton, Wallingford (Pa.), Pendle Hill Pamphlet 20, 1943, pp. 70, $0.25.

**The World of the Four Freedoms,* by Sumner Welles, New York, Columbia University Press, 1943, pp. x, 121, $1.75.

**Roots of Bergson's Philosophy,* by Ben-Ami Scharfstein, New York, Columbia University Press, pp. ix, 156, $1.75.

**Personalism in Theism: A Symposium in Honor of Albert Cornelius Knudson,* edited by Edgar Sheffield Brightman, Boston, Boston University Press, 1943, pp. xi, 257, $2.50.

Relief Deliveries and Relief Loans: 1913-1923, Geneva, League of Nations, 1943, pp. 62, $1.00.

**The New Order in the Church,* by William Adams Brown, Nashville, Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1943, pp. 189, $1.50.

**The Christian Philosophy of History,* by Shirley Jackson Case, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1943, pp. viii, 222, $2.00.

Four Freedoms and God, by Edwin McNeill Poteat, New York, Harper, 1943, pp. 155, $1.50.

A series of sermons on a theme which is distinctly more than the average slogan, by the pastor of the Euclid Avenue Baptist Church, Cleveland.

Plantation Life in the Florida Parishes of Louisiana, 1936-1946, as Reflected in the Diary of Bennet H. Barrow, by Edwin Adams Davis, New York, Columbia University Press, 1943, pp. xvi, 457, $5.00.

**John Amos Comenius—That Incomparable Moravian,* by Matthew Spinka, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1943, pp. 177, $2.00.

**The Imitation of Christ,* edited with an introduction by Edward J. Klein, New York, Harper, 1943, pp. xxv, 261, $1.50.

**From Jesus to Paul,* by Joseph Klausner, translated by William F. Stinespring, New York, Macmillan, 1943, pp. xvi, 624, $3.50.

**The Survival of Western Culture,* by Ralph Tyler Flewelling, New York, Harper, 1943, pp. xv, 304, $3.00.

**God and Evil,* by C. E. M. Joad, New York, Harper, 1943, pp. 349, $3.00.

**China's Religious Heritage,* by Y. C. Yang, Nashville, Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1943, pp. 196, $1.50.

New Testament Literature in 1942, edited by Merrill M. Parvis, Chicago, N.T. Club of the University of Chicago, 1942, pp. ix, 107, $0.50.

A very convenient list of books and articles.

* To be reviewed.